NORTH SLOPE FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING

PUBLIC MEETING

VOLUME II

North Slope Borough Chambers Utqiagvik, Alaska February 15, 2018 9:00 a.m.

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

Gordon Brower, Chair Rosemary Ahtuangaruak Esther S. Hugo Lee Kayotuk Wanda Kippi Steve Oomittuk Robert Shears Jerry Sikvayugak

Regional Council Coordinator, Eva Patton

Recorded and transcribed by:

Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC 135 Christensen Drive, Suite 2 Anchorage, AK 99501 907-243-0668/sahile@gci.net

```
2
```

Page 146

```
PROCEEDINGS

(Utqiagvik, Alaska - 2/15/2018)

(On record)
```

CHAIRMAN BROWER: I know it's -- we try to get started early or on time, because I know we tend to be long-winded at times, and we can easily go -- take all day. I would like to see -- I think we have a quorum, and that we can acknowledge the rest of the Council members when they come in, if you guys want to get started.

Yeah. Eva, I think knowing that Wanda's going to call in here. Was that you, Wanda?

MS. PATTON: Did somebody just join us on teleconference. Okay.

Maybe I'll make one quick announcement. We're waiting for Wanda to join us. Just a reminder to everyone that's joined us on teleconference, please mute your phones either by pushing the mute button or star-six, that will mute your phone. If you want to address the Council, just push star-six, and you can talk again. That really helps with the background noise. And especially from folks calling in from offices, please don't put your phone on hold or pick up another call when you're on teleconference. That sends us off into elevator music land. So just if you get an incoming call when you're on teleconference, if you could just disconnect and call back in, that would be most helpful.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Thank you.

MS. KIPPI: Good morning, Eva and

everybody.

42
43 CHAIRMAN BROWER: Yeah, good morning,
44 Wanda.

MS. PATTON: Good morning, Wanda.

48 Thank you.

```
Page 147
                     MS. KIPPI: Good morning.
 2
                     CHAIRMAN BROWER: All right.
 3
                                                   I think
 4
     we have everybody present that needs to be present now.
 5
     Eva, do we need to do a roll call for the second day?
 6
                     MS. PATTON: Yes, if we can establish
 7
     that we have quorum, that would be good.
 8
 9
                     CHAIRMAN BROWER: Very good.
10
                                                   So did
11
     you want to do the roll call, or what was the normal
     procedure then?
12
13
                     MS. PATTON: I believe Wanda is our
14
15
     secretary. Wanda, do you have the roster in front of
     you, or I can do roll call from here.
16
17
18
                     MS. KIPPI: Yes, I can do that.
19
                     MS. PATTON: Great. Thank you.
20
21
2.2
                     CHAIRMAN BROWER: All right. Get us
23
     back in order there, Wanda.
24
25
                     MS. KIPPI: All right. Gordon Brower.
26
                     CHAIRMAN BROWER: Here. Good morning.
27
28
29
                     MS. KIPPI: Good morning. Robert
30
     Shears.
31
                     MR. SHEARS: Good morning. Robert
32
33
     here.
34
35
                     MS. KIPPI: Good morning. Wanda Kippi
     is here.
36
37
38
                     Steve Oomittuk.
39
40
                     MR. OOMITTUK: Here.
41
                     MS. KIPPI: Fredrick Neakok. I believe
42
     he has been excused or no?
43
44
                     CHAIRMAN BROWER: Yeah, he's excused.
45
     He was in Anaktuvuk under business.
46
47
                     MS. KIPPI: Okay. It got pretty quiet,
48
     I couldn't hear anything for the moment.
49
50
```

```
Page 148
                     Jerry Sikvayugak?
 1
 2
 3
                     MR. SIKVAYUGAK: Here.
 4
 5
                     MS. KIPPI: Good morning. Esther Hugo.
 6
 7
                     MS. HUGO: Here.
                                       Good morning.
 8
 9
                     MS. KIPPI: Good morning, Esther.
10
     Lee Kayotuk.
11
12
                                          Good morning.
                     MR. KAYOTUK: Here.
13
                     MS. KIPPI: Good morning.
14
                                                Rosemary
15
     Ahtuangaruak.
16
                     MS. AHTUANGARUAK: Good morning.
17
18
19
                     MS. KIPPI: Good morning, Rosemary.
                                                           Ι
20
     believe we have a quorum.
21
2.2
                     CHAIRMAN BROWER:
                                       Thank you, Madam
23
     Secretary Wanda in Atgasuk.
24
25
                     MS. KIPPI: You're welcome.
26
27
                     CHAIRMAN BROWER: We're going to go to
     the next order of business. We are officially out of
28
     recess and back in business. So if Madam Coordinator
29
     Eva, if you could direct us into our next order of
30
     business, maybe -- are we still on new business or are
31
     we ready to do old business.
32
33
                     MS. PATTON: Mr. Chair and Council, we
34
35
     concluded new business yesterday, so we're back to old
     business, which the Council had confirmed that they'd
36
     like to have caribou updates for the Western Arctic
37
38
     Caribou Herd prior to consideration of the Unit 23
     proposal again. So we have Ryan Klimstra here, and he
39
     does have a PowerPoint, and the video screens aren't
40
41
     lined up so well for the Council, so it's easier for
     the Council, you can sit in the theater seats to be
42
     able to observe the presentation. And you can always
43
     come up to the mic at the front desk for any questions.
44
45
                     CHAIRMAN BROWER: Very good.
46
47
     give the floor to ADF&G, Ryan Klimstra to go ahead and
     get the caribou up date going.
48
49
50
```

It would have been great if you were here, Wanda, because sometimes these caribou updates and the PowerPoints are pretty important visuals, you know.

 $$\operatorname{MS.}$ KIPPI: Yes, I wish I were. But I'll be listening.

CHAIRMAN BROWER: We'll try to let Ryan describe each page so you can have a very good visual.

MS. KIPPI: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Ryan, you have the

 floor.

MR. KLIMSTRA: Thank you, Gordon. I'm going to give it just a moment for these screens to load here.

CHAIRMAN: Okay. I'll sit.

(Pause -- setting up PowerPoint)

MR. KLIMSTRA: Okay. Again my name is Ryan Klimstra with Alaska Department of Fish and Game. I'm going to talk about caribou today, two herds in particular. The Western Arctic herd, and the Teshekpuk Caribou Herd. I'm going to focus on those. And I also passed out a handout to you earlier, yesterday, with an update on the Central Arctic Herd. Hopefully you had time to review that.

Before we get too far down the road, Region 5 has some news for you folks here in Barrow. We have a new Barrow area biologist. So Carmen Daggett who's sitting back here is going to be moving to Barrow from Kotzebue probably later in May. She's lived and worked in Kotzebue for quite some time now. I think probably around five years. And, you know, we anticipate some good things from Carmen. And, yeah, we just want to share that with you and let you know that we have succeeded in replacing -- or getting somebody in this seat here. So hopefully that will help out with the community or communities across the North Slope.

So the general presentation outline, we're going to talk about the Western Arctic Caribou

Page 150

Herd, the Teshekpuk Caribou Herd, and then a little bit about RC 907, the registration permit. So, you know, this is almost the identical presentation that I gave in November. So I don't anticipate there's going to be a lot of discussion about things other than maybe the photo census results are all very positive for these two herds, and, you know, that's — it was my understanding that that was the wish of the Council is to have an updated number so you could think about this 23 closure, and that's what I'm going to do, is I'm just going to provide you with updated information on the most recent photo census.

MS. AHTUANGARUAK: Ryan?

MR. KLIMSTRA: Yes.

MS. AHTUANGARUAK: On the changes in the technique on the photo census, how did the interpretation of that data, if you have clearer pictures.....

 $$\operatorname{\textsc{REPORTER}}$:$$ Rosemary, could you come to the mic? Sorry.

MR. KLIMSTRA: Okay. We got a question from Rosemary coming up here.

Hold on just a sec.

MS. AHTUANGARUAK: I have a question on the way that -- the change in the way that the census is being done with the improvements to the photo censuses. How does that interpret the data results when we had poorer resolution on the previous photo censuses to the accuracy of what we're seeing, and how much of the error or variable does that change in the data that we're interpreting?

MR. KLIMSTRA: Yeah. Thanks for that question, Rosemary, and if you'll just hold on for a little bit, we'll get there. Hopefully I'll answer that, and I haven't answered it by the end of the presentation, remind me, and we'll talk about it some more.

Okay. So we'll start out, you know, we've all seen these slides just as of November. Just as a reminder here on some of the seasonal ranges of

the Western Arctic Caribou Herd.

So again this is a refresher here. All the vital rate, you know, indices that we collect throughout the year were very positive for the Western Arctic Herd. As you can see here, adult female survival is around 84 percent. Yearling recruitment was high. Calf survival high. Calf production high. Body condition was great. Calf weights, you know, were around 92 pounds. Again as you remember, this past year when we were trying to weigh calves at Onion Portage, the migration just wasn't coming through, so we got a very small sample size there of three. And the same for adults. But in general from what we're hearing from hunters on the landscape, the condition of the animals was good this past year.

And in October the herd composition, we had 54 bulls for every 100 cows, which is also high, and then 57 calves for every 100 cows, which is also high. So those are all very positive things. And that was.....

I just want to remind everybody, and if you look back in previous meetings, these are the messages that we've been sharing for the past two years for this herd and for the Teshekpuk.

So we were able to accomplish a 2017 photo census. These photos were taken this past summer. The weather and the caribou aggregation conditions for the Teshekpuk -- or, excuse me, for the Western Arctic Herd were not quite ideal; however, the camera equipment that has been upgraded, you know, may have increased the accuracy of our photos, and also allowed us to take photos under tougher light conditions than normally we would not be able to operate.

The photos have been counted. So that's where we left off in November. That's about where we were. And so now we have a number. So for the Western Arctic Herd, we've gone from around 200,000 animals to approximately 260,000.

Now, the two differences here I want to point out right away. So we have a minimum count and then a rivest estimate. And you've probably heard Lincoln talk about these plenty of times before, but

Page 152

the minimum count is the number of caribou that we physically counted, you know, on a computer from the photos. We know that there are 239,055 caribou. Now, the rivest estimate is a statistical estimator that essentially takes into account a bunch of information, such as the number of collared animals, the number of collars per group, the number of missing collars that we're not able to find on the day of the photo census, you know, the size of the group, and all those different things, and then it calculates what it thinks, you know, what there potentially could be on the landscape, and that is 260,000 plus or minus 26,779 caribou.

So that's in our mind, and hopefully in your mind, too, these are good things. Right? This is good news in terms of, you know, all the users and -- of caribou out on the landscape, this is good news.

21 22

So again here is -- you've seen this particular graph many times. This is the abundance of the Western Arctic Herd through time. And there over on the end we've got that 260,000 caribou. The blue dots on this particular graph are the rivest estimates, and the red X is the minimum population count. And, of course, those bars are our confidence intervals. And as you can see, the minimum population falls within the confidence interval, and that makes perfect sense for this year. Excuse me.

 So again you saw this in November as well, and this is just -- I wanted just to provide this again for the things you're about to talk about regarding the Unit 23 closure. This just represents harvest from 1998 through 2015.

And then additionally, something new over this past year is the 2017 calf survival study. This is something that the communities and Unit 23 and in the region that Western Arctic caribou roam, you know, they asked for this, and we have done it. Or we're working on it.

So in June of 2017 we collared 78 calves with the Western Arctic Herd. So there's 70 initial captures plus eight redeployments in the first week. So those redeployments are either collars fell off or that calf was predated or something along those lines. So the mortalities on the calving grounds

equals 18, about 77 percent survival. Cause of mortality as you can see there. We've got brown bear, golden eagle, abandonment or drowning, in that order.

So post calving ground survival, which is kind of interesting, you know, so once they have kind of dispersed from the calving grounds, you know—and presently—and this may be a little outdated. This is the last time we were able to fly these, when the weather allowed was back in October. So at that time there's 51 animals were still alive. That's 65 percent survival. And of the mortalities that occurred post—calving, again we had brown bear, golden eagle, wolf, two unknown, and three at this time unable to retrieve or determine the cause of death.

2.2

So a summary for the Western Arctic Herd caribou. So this recent decline that we were all extremely concerned in, we're confident this has stabilized if not reversed, you know. And there are still a lot of good science biologically out there with those caribou that we've been collecting throughout the year.

And, you know, we'll report in the spring what the over-winter survival is. You know, of course, that Western Arctic herd calf survival study is on track. We'll continue that next year.

And then we still need harvest data. And I'll elaborate on that once we get through the Teshekpuk Herd. And then also I'll address more of Rosemary's question here, but I just want to get through both herds first.

 Okay. So the Teshekpuk Caribou overview. Again here is a picture you all are very familial with. It's the seasonal ranges of the Teshekpuk Caribou Herd.

So other biological data for this herd, you know, these are those vital rates that we collect all year long. And there's been two years since the most recent photo census, but I've just reported over the past year. So these are all very, very positive, encouraging things. And this has been the second year in row, I'm talking about 2017, where we've been collecting these positive, encouraging signs.

So adult female survival is high for Teshekpuk Herd. And the yearling recruitment was about average this past year. Even weights were about average, and calf production was high. So those are all very good things for us, the Teshekpuk Herd.

5 6 7

8

10

11

12

13

14 15

1

3

4

We weren't able to accomplish a composition survey this past fall due to weather and other things, but in 2016 we had 28 bulls for 100 cows. I put low on there, and that's just, you know, low based on, you know, long-term average. And it's not even really terribly low. You know, low's maybe not even a good descriptor. 28 bulls for 100 cows, caribou biologists would argue that's plenty of bulls on the landscape to get the job done. In terms of hunter satisfaction, that may be a different issue.

16 17 18

So 48 calves for 100 cows, that's also a very positive metric that we collected.

19 20 21

2.2

23

24 25 So what does that mean for the census? So if you'll recall, we were at around 40,000 animals for the Teshekpuk Caribou Herd. Well, our minimum count this year was 56,255 animals. The Rivest estimate was 55,614 animals plus or minus 6,000 animals.

26 27 28

29

30

31

32

33 34

35

36

37

38

39

40 41

42

43

44

45

46

47

So you might be wondering, well, how can the minimum count be higher than the actual estimate? And that occurs whenever you pick up a lot of groups that don't have collars in them. So this particular statistical estimator does not take into account groups on the landscape that don't have collars that you find, although when we're up there flying around and tracking all these collars, you know, there's over 100 collars on this herd right now, it's not uncommon to, oop, there's 200 caribou over off the right side of the plane that does not have a collar in that group, and we add that to our minimum count to be realistic here, but the Rivest estimator does not take those into account. So that's why it seems a little bit lower there. But I want to point out that the minimum count is within the confidence intervals of the Rivest estimate, as you can see here in this particular figure that you've seen many, many times before. that minimum count and the Rivest estimate are real close to one another, so that's good, positive news for the Teshekpuk Herd.

So summary for the Teshekpuk Herd. It is safe to say that the Teshekpuk Herd is not declining or stable. It is growing. We are confident that it is growing. There are still good signs biologically that we're collecting, you know. This spring, as long as we continue to have these positive biological signs, it will be a third year in a row of that, of, you know, good information that we're getting that, you know, lends itself to herd growth or just a positive phase in this herd.

So we still need harvest data. You know, the reason why I include that on both of these summaries is for many different reasons. The harvest data is something that, you know, we have noticed that communities across the North Slope are interested in. Folks want to know who's harvesting, how many are harvested, where is harvest occurring, you know, who makes up that harvest. Well, we want to provide that, you know, and that's art of the reason why we implemented RC 907.

And I know, you know, the gut feeling for a lot of folks may be, well, hey, man, you know, these two herds have kind of started to rebound. You know, why is it important to have harvest data now? And, you know, that's an okay feeling to have, but, you know, I think it goes along the mind set of, you know, when is it time to improve on things? You know, it's not when your hair is on fire and you're running around screaming. It's when you're in a good state, you know. And so we're looking at this as a real good opportunity to continue down a road that we've already started, you know, making really good progress on, you know.

And some of the things that this harvest data with this RC 907 permit can help address are other issues that go in line with harvest. Things such as user conflict. You know, with this harvest data, we will have a better idea of temporal and spatial components to harvest that will -- that might help address, you know, what's really going on with user conflict issues. You know, the timing of harvest is really important.

And then something that gets brought up quite a bit, you know, that Gordon brings up, and I know Harry brings up, is, you know, the ANS, the combined ANS for both the Teshekpuk and the Western

Arctic Herd. Well, this is another way to get at that, on separating those things. If we don't understand harvest, then we can's possibly separate ANS.

3 4 5

> 6 7

> 8

9

2

You know, I understand that the registration permit is still a new thing, you know, and we're still committed to working with residents and, you know, getting the information out there, making the permits available, and, you know, trying to make it as easy as possible for them to report their harvest.

10 11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22 So what have we kind of learned so far from the harvest data? Well, we're not even through one regulatory year yet, so it's tough to say exactly what we've learned other than we know in Unit 23 that a lot of those communities that were reporting on the RC 900, they're still, you know -- or they were already reporting with RC 900. They haven't really increased, some of those villages. But, you know, other communities are like in the ball game now. And so this -- I just want to show these couple figures here on what is possible, you know, like what Unit 23 is doing, and what we can do here in 26A to aid and things.

232425

So I'm going to move that chair just a minute so you can see a little better.

26 27 28

Or maybe Eva's going to help me there.

29 30

Thank you, Eva.

31 32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40 41

42

43

44

45

So again I showed this in November, and I just want this just to be a reminder for folks. So previous to RC 907 there was something called RC 900 that was in place, and across the region where that was required, which is Unit 26A, 23, 22, the range of the Western Arctic Herd and Teshekpuk Herd, RC 900 we distributed 1,032 of those. And Unit 22, they kind of got out ahead of things, and saw that there was, you know, a need for harvest data, and they implemented something called RC 800 in 2016. And they really put their feet on the ground and got out there and tried to distribute this thing in hopes of gaining more data for the Western Arctic Herd harvest in their area. Well, 23 and 26A, we were still on RC 900, but as you can see, it went up. 1250.

46 47 48

And then now 2017, as of July 1st, everybody was under these two similar permits. RC 800

and RC 907 are basically capturing the same thing. Very similar. And all I've got on here is 1141. Well, this number, I didn't have time to update this. This was just as of early November. So this is really encouraging, you know. This is a really encouraging thing.

So again, to break it down for Unit 26A and 23 in particular, let's remove 22 out of there, the Nome area, so RC 900, in 2015 we had 551 of those out. It went down a little bit in 2016 to 531. And then, guess what, again early November, RC 907, we're already exceeded what we were doing on an annual basis, and we still have several months left. Lots of good time to hunt caribou. So there's lots of time to get permits still and report harvest.

Now, unfortunately the bulk of that was Unit 23. so far in 26A there's been -- and this is again was as of November, there's been 37 permits distributed and 533 in Unit 23. So I think we've got some room for improvement.

And, you know, I just want to address that a little bit further. I know, you know, one thing that we keep in mind here is that it can be difficult to get a license of a permit in some of these villages. And we've put a lot of effort into establishing vendors, new vendors, in some of these villages, and we've had quite a bit of success. But we've also visited the villages more over this past year since July -- or even pre-July 1st. We wanted to be there before this even rolled out. You know, we visited these villages more in the past, you know, six months, eight months, than we have in years. And it's been a good response from the communities, and we've really appreciated the participation of folks and, you know, we're looking to continue that in the future.

Now, to get back to kind of what Rosemary was asking about, the differences between, you know, the digital photo census and the film photo census. That's a very good question, you know, in terms of what are those differences. And at this time, I don't know that we know how go get at those differences specifically. What we do know is that all these vital rate indices that we have been collecting kind of match up with what this new photo census gave us in terms of the numbers. Now, you know, I will not

sit and -- no one from Fish and Game will tell you that we have not added new caribou because of the new digital census. Everyone understands that we -- you know, these photos are clearer, you know. We're able to somewhat tell the difference between adults and calves, like a pretty good -- you know, I'd say that's one of the huge things. And then also we're able to take these photos under varying light conditions, and we don't have the problems of the shadows. We don't have the problems that we were suffering from with the film system.

So that's a very good question, you know, on what these differences are and what does that mean. Right now we don't know, but we're looking into it, you know. We understand that that's a thing, that, hey, there's some differences there. And how to quantify those differences, that's still in the works, you know. But we just wanted people to know that we're acknowledging that, and we're also acknowledging the fact that we want the public to acknowledge, you know, that the story we've been telling, you know, for the past two years about these herds, you know, kind of fits to these new estimates that we got. And, you know, we feel confident about it.

And the other thing is, you know, it's kind of like with wildlife management, you know, you're always trying to do a little bit better than you had in the past. And this was our opportunity, you know, was to improve upon something for the people, you know, so we can do our job better to provide you with better information, especially when you have to make decisions like you're about to make in a few minutes. And, you know, that doesn't mean it doesn't come with a little bit of heartache or a little bit of uncertainty around certain parts of it, but, you know, we're doing the best that we possibly can to make sure that we acknowledge that, and also, you know, get to the bottom of it if we can.

 $$\operatorname{\textsc{No}}$$ So hopefully that answers your question there, Rosemary.

MS. AHTUANGARUAK: Yeah, I think that does provide some answers, but it also does solidify that we have some concerns about the way that this data is being interpreted. It would be best for us to be on the safe side, and that's a few years of data

 Page 159

accumulation occur to make sure that the numbers are increase in population, not increasing in digitalization that allows us to count animals that wasn't previously counted and that affects the population data. So definitely I understand and see in variations of what we had with previous views and some of the ways that you're doing the counting, but I also know that in this newer digitalization that we have animals that are being counted that weren't counted before, and that affects the way that we're assessing the interpretation of this data. And being cautious and letting us go through a period of time where we improve the confidence that these are true population increases and not related to new technique that counted animals that would not have been counted in the previous way.

Thank you.

MR. KLIMSTRA: Yeah. That's an excellent point, Rosemary. Thank you for that. And I want to say we hear you loud and clear on that one. We have no intention of using this new estimate to also change regulations or anything like that. You know, I think we're all very excited at what this new technology can do for us, but we're also all very anxious on the next several photo censuses, to see what those are. So that's a good point that you brought up there. And we feel the same way.

MR. OOMITTUK: I have a -- you know, the last couple years we've seen a high number of predators, you know. What percentage do the predators take of this Western Arctic Caribou Herd, or do you know that? You know, the last two years in Point Hope alone so many wolves have been caught. You know, we've never seen so many, you know, the younger generation going home with three or four wolves at a time, you know. And, you know, this last two years, you know, the wolves, wolverines, grizzly bears. They even saw a grizzly bear track out this early, you know, out of hibernation. Do you guys know what percentage the predators take of the herds?

MR. KLIMSTRA: Yeah, thanks, Steve. That's an excellent question. And, you know, I don't have that exact percentage for you at this time, but I know that we have some -- a little bit of data on that in terms of whenever we go to pick up a collar,

whenever we get a mort signal from a collar, and we go out onto the land to pick that collar up. There is some information about the cause of death on those animals. I don't have that right in front of me, but I'll be sure to gather that information, unless Lincoln or Alex are on the line, which I don't think they are. I'll be sure to gather that information and pass that along.

But, you know, I'm hearing that from guys Slope-wide, you know, wolves -- a lot of predators out there. So, you know, I think that, you know, Point Hope is kind of mirroring what's going on everywhere. And, you know, maybe some of that can be explained by, hey, numbers are going up, predators are increasing. I don't know. We don't -- you know, it's tough to say at this time, but, yeah, interesting observation. I'll get back to you.

CHAIRMAN BROWER: All right. This is Gordon Brower for the record.

And in looking at the new count based on new equipment, I tend to agree with Rosemary, you know, we just got through, at least since 2014, critical dialogue of the Teshekpuk Herd, critical dialogue about the Western Arctic Herd. And dire straits dialogue about the Central Arctic Herd. It would be, I think, very prudent, because I've seen all of the scientists of the North Slope Borough in looking at confidence levels and intervals when they create models to support.

Let's just say, for example, the acoustical monitoring for bowhead whale movements across the oil patch near North Star Island. It was an ordinance of the Borough to study the impact and the deflection of the movement of bowhead whales as it encountered North Star Island. It's an oil production island in 39 feet of water. You could see bowhead whales moving across, visibly you could see there.

So they had -- and then the information is also funneled to the North Slope Borough Science Advisory Committee of the mayor. Senior scientists from universities and very achieved scientists that are part of the North Slope Borough's Science Advisory Committee go in to interpret the movements of these to reflect on the impact that the availability of these

resources was not going to be impacted to such.

So, anyway, you kind of look at kind of seeing where I'm trending, where I'm talking about, is maybe a blip with new information is not yet -- it's a good sign. I have a good feeling about it, but it should not be based -- be the basis of making rash decisions. Let's look at it maybe and create a substantial trend that we are....

MR. KLIMSTRA: That's what I'm saying, Gordon, is, you know, we all feel the same way here in terms of, you know, nobody's running anywhere to say, oh, well, okay, we got to do something new, because, you know -- and this fits in line with, you know, what folks on the land are saying, you know, all the metrics we've been collecting, and, yeah, I -- yeah, no one is trying to make any kind of regulation changes based on these new numbers. That's just not possible.

2.2

 CHAIRMAN BROWER: I mean, I wasn't saying that, but maybe -- but I lost my train of thought when you interrupted me there, so, you know, old people like me -- or kind of old people, you know, you interrupt their train of thought, and we start thinking about lollipops at that point.

 So with that, anyway, that's what I was going. We need to look at -- I think it's a fantastic new tool. I think it's the wave of the future to have digital imagery. But I think a simple blip could be an outlier, and we need to establish trends to make decisions off of. That's where I just wanted to make. Because science is like that. They have to establish trends. It's very critical.

And I think if we could do what we've done with the bowhead whale -- I mean, it's such major control. We can't even allow seismic operations in its wake. We can't. And we have conflict avoidance agreements that are created out of North Slope -- not created by the North Slope Borough, but as a side effect, because the North Slope Borough has said, you must to into warm shut-down mode. No barging of equipment and oilfield activities until the movement of bowhead whales or the quotas have been met.

We can basically do the same thing on land, especially, you know, around these areas to

provide a meaningful opportunity and reasonable harvest levels for the communities. Anyway, we've never gone that way on land, but we sure did it on the marine mammals, for bowhead whale.

4 5 6

2

3

MR. KLIMSTRA: Thank you for that, Gordon, and I hope this digital photo census is a step in that direction.

8 9 10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17 18

7

I just also wanted to remind this Council that 2019 will be the year that folks can start submitting proposals to the Board of Game, and then the Board of Game will meet again for this particular region in 2020. I'm not saying -- you know, I just wanted to remind folks that somebody could be putting a proposal or something, so just have that on the radar and, you know, we'll continue to provide information as transparently as we can to move forward through this thing.

19 20

Lee.

212223

26

27

28

29 30

31

32

33 34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

MR. KAYOTUK: Lee Kayotuk for the

24 record. 25

> Yeah, when we notice the caribou in our village, the caribou is being pushed towards the village because of predators. And I believe that the caribou that is getting away is moving towards the people because of the predators are pushing them away. And we found out last year that the caribou's moving towards a village, towards more people that have -- you know, we had a couple caribou that came in just not even like a couple weeks ago that moved towards the village that's getting away from predators. And we've been seeing that from, you know, just getting away from like wolves or wolverines that are chasing them. we noticed that we've got a point that, you know, they're smart. We said, well, we're going to get away from these people and -- I mean our predators and move towards the village, and, you know, people just started -- try to check out for the wolves and that, because the caribou are moving more closer to the village to keep away from predators.

44 45 46

Thank you.

47 48

MR. KLIMSTRA: Yeah, thanks for that observation, Lee. Again, that just confirms and

corroborates with everyone else. I mean, there seems to be a lot of predators out there, and I encourage folks to get a hunting license and a trapping license and get after it.

MS. HUGO: Good morning.

MR. KLIMSTRA: Good morning, Esther.

 MS. HUGO: Can you go back to that data on the 26, Nome. It's in the beginning. It's the number were -- there. Well, it shows how much the 26A harvest is, but how could we harvest that many caribou? They didn't even come by or it was after rutting season. Where did you get those numbers from if we barely even got 100 or 50 in the community?

 MR. KLIMSTRA: That particular number, Esther, I -- yeah, that doesn't represent Anaktuvuk. I know where you're coming from here. That's for all villages, 26A. So that includes Wainwright, Atqasuk, you know. Point Lay, Barrow. So it's all those -- all villages, not just for Anaktuvuk. And, you know -- and that's just for the Western Arctic Caribou Herd. That's just the ones that we think are harvested. But again, you know, it changes from year to year. That's the long-term average. And it's really tough to get at, to know what the accurate number is without, you know, accurate harvest data. And this is just from community household surveys, and this is an estimate of, you know, long-term average.

MS. HUGO: I know, but the numbers for our village shouldn't even be included at all.

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$ KLIMSTRA: Well, your numbers are included in there.....

 $\,$ MS. HUGO: It should be zero or less than 20.

MR. KLIMSTRA: Well, for 26A there's, you know, six villages in 26A, so.....

MS. HUGO: I understand that. For our village. I mean, I'm talking about....

MR. KLIMSTRA: Oh, yeah, yeah, for Anaktuvuk, yeah. I mean there's been years where you

guys have had very, very low harvest.

2 3 4

MS. HUGO: I mean, you're putting that number, I mean, for our community.

5 6

7

MR. KLIMSTRA: Sure, if I were to -- if we were to break this down into by community, yeah, yours would be very low. Yeah.

8 9 10

MS. HUGO: That's all I wanted to know.

11 12

MR. KLIMSTRA: Except for this year. You guys have been doing pretty good?

13 14 15

MS. HUGO: Not really, no.

16 17

MR. KLIMSTRA: For caribou harvest?

18 No? Okay.

19 20

21

22 23 MR. SIKVAYUGAK: Yeah, it would be good if we had the accurate numbers, not your rough estimates. Kind of -- rough estimates won't get us nowhere. We need the accurate numbers for all community.

242526

27

28

29

MR. KLIMSTRA: Yeah, I agree with you 100 percent, Jerry. And that RC 907, that will get us there. That will get us those accurate numbers if we use that registration permit. Until then, we don't have a way to have accurate data on harvest.

30 31 32

33 34

35

36

37 38

39

40 41

42

43

44

45

46 47

48

49 50

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Just I wanted to comment on that as well. I think it's very important that we all advocate for participation of all of our communities so that, you know, this data, they could use it how they want to do it, but we can also use that data, too. And it's important, I think, nowadays, because we continue to struggle, and when serious conflicts come around and I've seen it for myself when, you know, the non-rural use issue comes around and arguments start to ensue. And pretty soon you get a dead caribou testifying in front of everybody. So it's very heart wrenching to do these kind -- but when we got raw data that is consistent and then we advocate for it, I'm one, that I tell my son, you're going to go catch a caribou, you better -- you know, we better report it, and we better account for it, because, you know, we have respect for our animals. And now our animals have rights, too. They need to be counted, and

how they die and whether it's a wolf eating it or if I'm eating, it's critical fort they get counted nowadays and weigh against the living population of those animals, so it's important.

I think all of us as Council members -because I've expressed it and then had very big
backlash saying, what the hell, you're trying to get me
to apply for a license. I have the right to hunt. I'm
a Native, and, yeah, and it's my right, and I don't
need to -- I came living with the right to kill that
animal. Yeah, I think that's true, but when the animal
population and competing uses become argumentative, I
think it's important for us to be part of the solution,
too.

MR. KLIMSTRA: I couldn't agree more with you, Gordon. And just to elaborate on that just briefly. One last point is, you know, being a part of it gives you a say, you know. Like I gives you ownership when you go to the Board of Game who is the one who ultimately makes decisions. You know, if we have harvest data from 26A, we can say, now, wait a minute. I think we should steer this thing in this direction. Here's why, you know. If we don't have that, then unfortunately it's kind of like, well, we're just along for the ride. And so that's an excellent point you just brought up, Gordon.

CHAIRMAN BROWER: And just one more thing. We're always being law abiding I think. We're always law abiding. In our management for the bowhead whale, if I strike a whale with a calf, our own Whaling Captains Association, our own AWC will sanction you. And the tribe will take your gear away. The tribe will take your gear away. They'll take your harpoons. They'll take your shoulder guns. They'll take all your bombs. And you will be sanctioned for five years from hunting that whale again. That's how strict the comanagement regime for bowhead whale is. And we are law abiding, because they are very controlled.

I just wanted to express that, because we already live by some regulations, and we have been masters of stewardship in doing that for our own people. And I think it's important to recognize it's -- the caribou, we've been struggling with it over five years already and the declining numbers. I'm elated that numbers seem to be rebounding, and we hope that

trend starts to develop into a format that we can all be able to express.

2 3 4

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21 22

23

24 25

26

27

28

29

30

At the same time I want to -- I think there's a need to work with local governments, including the zoning. Not just the wildlife department, including the zoning, because through zoning and the use of policy, that's how we have land use policies on bowhead whale, the availability of those resources. Even for terrestrial. You've just got to sit down and go through some of the policies that are geared to -- now going to be more important for the area of influence that are being adopted by ordinances for every village, and those area of influence about contemporary and traditional activities in those area where our policy of the North Slope Borough, which the state is bound to abide by, that subsistence resources prohibiting the subsistence of subsistence resources -- it's reasonable opportunity for subsistence harvesting subsistence resources where they're normally found. Not where they're normally displaced. Not where they're normally moved by other competing uses. It may mean that out of those kind of policies stipulations like in our permits might say, between July and October 15, this particular area in the wake of the movement of large scale terrestrial mammals may be off limits for a window -- a period of time just like we do for bowhead whales, which highly legal and align use policy. And there's things I think where the State and Feds, we need to come together with local as we enact some of these kinds of rules.

31 32 33

Thank you.

34 35

36 37 MR. KLIMSTRA: Thank you, Mr. Chair and Council. I appreciate your time, and I'm glad we had some -- oh, we've got another....

38 39

 $$\operatorname{MS}$. AHTUANGARUAK: We have a question in audience, and I also have a question.

40 41 42

CHAIRMAN BROWER: What was your name

43 again?

MS. AHTUANGARUAK: Carmen.

45 46 47

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Carmen.

48 49

MS. DAGGETT: My name is Carmen. And I

guess I just wanted to ask you guys since you had lots of wonderful points about the kickback that we get from people and trying to get buy-in. Maybe at some point it would be good to have some sort of discussion about ideas that you guys have for trying to help people understand what to do in each village, and personalize the approach for getting those permits out to each of those villages. Maybe not necessarily.....

MR. KLIMSTRA: Yeah. Maybe at a break we can talk a little bit about that.

It's a good idea. Yep.

MS. DAGGETT: Yeah, I didn't mean right now, but in general it would be good to have you guys' perspective on that. You know your communities best, and we want to tailor our efforts for that.

Thank you.

 MS. AHTUANGARUAK: We've expressed concern about the way that the State has accumulated data and then layers of information, so we expressed concerns that we'd like to see some of these broke down by years, not lumping all of the years together into that research, similar to what Anaktuvuk had in their questions, that if we had saw this broke out into a number of years, it would be a very different interpretation instead of a solid number at over 1,000 of harvest; whereas you would see increasing conflict with subsistence harvesting over decades of time.

Also, I noticed that this report comes out in '98, and for Nuiqsut, the subsistence harvest impacts related to the Alpine development, we don't have the data prior to Alpine, and we have data accumulating after Alpine. And so that really affects the way that the data is being accumulated.

The other factor is that when we have hunters that go out, like my son went out a few years ago, and he traveled over 300 miles to harvest caribou and brought that back and shared with 19 families, but yet we have different survey efforts to limit the data points to a 60 or 70-mile radius around the village, but yet when we have hunters that are traveling over 300 miles, they're not included in those data points. And how do we get some of that important variables that

are very important about how hard we're working to harvest with the demands that are being put on us, and the changes that are happening near our community where our harvest data points are not being included, because they're not being allowed by research data limiters. And that it really impact how do we interpret some of this important data.

MR. KLIMSTRA: Those are all excellent points again, Rosemary. It kind of goes in line with what Jerry was saying, you know, and like how do you split this thing about. Well, we haven't been able to, because we don't have the data. You know, like -- but RC 907, man, that we now have the tool in our hands to get that data. We now all have the tool to get that data on a yearly basis. And then we can really look -- we can start to look at those spatial differences, and also, you know, does Anaktuvuk this year only get 10 caribou, or did they get, you know, 200 on a specific year rather than relying on, you know, household surveys and such, that RC 907, man, that would get it every single year, if we can get people to participate.

MS. AHTUANGARUAK: Also the interpretation of the protections that were given to the Porcupine Herd with their protections on the Canadian side to protect the calving grounds, and the other three herds in the Arctic on the Alaska side do not have those protections, and how does that translate into the interpretation of the data that's being presented.

 MR. KLIMSTRA: Sure, that's another good point. I'm not too familiar with what's going on on the Canadian side there, but, you know, your point's well taken there.

Thank you.

I've got one last question that's kind of an aside. How many folks sitting up here are also on the Fish and Game Management Committee with the North Slope Borough? I think there's a couple -- there's just two. I need to talk to you guys separately later about something else.

But, okay, thank you very much.

Thanks for your time.

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Hey, Ryan, I had a couple -- I had one here that Bob gave me a couple notes.

3 4 5

2

MR. KLIMSTRA: Oh, sure.

6 7

8

9

CHAIRMAN BROWER: He had to go before a compensation committee for 30 minutes. He'll be right back. But he did write down, ask about ADF&G continued commitment towards funding accurate counting.

10 11 12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21 22

23

2425

26

27

28

29

30

31

MR. KLIMSTRA: Yeah. No, that's -with this new digital system, boy, have we -- do we think we're there now. You know, here's an example. So, you know, in terms of funding it, this new digital system also is going to save some money. You know, the photo census can be really expensive with that film system, and everything just has to align just perfectly, you know, the conditions, the availability of the photo planes, you know, the caribou have to aggregate properly. The caribou still have to aggregate properly. We've got a little more wiggle room on the conditions. And then the overall cost is much lower with this new digital system. I think my difference this year for a photo census was something like eight grand less to complete a day's worth of work, which was a tremendous value. So we're fully committed to, you know, funding this thing. We've purchased all the equipment, it's ours. And so now we're just, you know, we're going forward. That's the plan is to go forward with this new system and keep you all with us as we travel.

32 33 34

35

36

37 38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Lastly I've got one last thing. And this is something that was bothering me last night after we had a little bit of update on the charter and some of the dialogue that's there, but also some opportunities I thought. But I think those opportunities would have to be worked between the State, the Feds, and the local North Slope Borough to work together to come up with a different way of doing things and achieving the goals that we all need to achieve all those goals. The Borough in its creation of village comprehensive plans, adopting those by ordinance into laws of the North Slope Borough, the village area of influence, the language in the proposed -- maybe it is not proposed, but the charter signed by Zinke to do this, this and that. And it was kind of startling to look at it, but there's opportunities.

Page 170

And I look at the Teshekpuk Special Area as an example. Our own study, and it's called the NPR-A technical report, maybe in short the technical report, we're supposed to -- we have been funded through impact funds to do a comprehensive oil and gas plan for the North Slope Borough, but it was too daunting of a task, and it got whittled down to, you know, NPR-A technical report, and then to the oil and gas technical report for the Borough, but funded out of NPR-A. Anyway, long story short, if you take a look at some of that and the concerns raised in the technical report over the special area around Teshekpuk, and what it can potentially do, using the radio-collar information that was provided by Parent....

Somebody obviously doesn't want me to explain this.

Do we need to stop talking now or.....

2.2

MS. PATTON: Yeah, please stop talking just for one minute.

(Pause -- music playing -- re-establishing teleconference)

MS. PATTON: Thank you. Go ahead.

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Thank you. That was quicker than the last time. Last time we had to take a substantial break. It was short enough to keep my memory I think.

All right.

 And I think I alluded to the North Slope Borough's technical report. And there was some concerning stuff in there about the accidental study around the Red Dog Mine road. ADF&G has some information on that with radio-collared information when the hesitation to cross the road and return back and go back through the mountains on the other side.

MR. KLIMSTRA: Yep, that's correct.

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Probably about, I don't know, maybe 15,000 of those caribous died in that process as well. Anyway, that and the animation that shows the Central Arctic Herd and its habituation on

Page 171

the Dalton Highway. And then dissecting into two groups to calving, which are highly altered calving — core calving areas. If you look at our own North Slope Borough atlas that was approved in 1988 with information that was developed probably in the 70s and early 80s show that core calving to be around Milne Point, around the coastline over there. Currently they calve about 25 miles inland around by melt water, and then separated by the Trans Alaska Pipeline into Badami Oil Field, over that way. So if you look at that and the complete habituation of the Central Arctic Herd, they don't deviate from the Haul Road corridor. You just don't see them deviate. You can pull up the collared information for the last two decades, and they do not deviate from that corridor.

So one of the concerns, and using all of that information and what information was garnered from the Red Dog Mine and the crossing problem, other related issues, and things like that, and then the drawing of the special area around the Teshekpuk Herd, suggesting no permanent infrastructure, no roads, no pipelines, no surface stuff in this Teshekpuk special area management plan, and relegated that kind of stuff to be outside of that box that was drawn. And if you put that transportation corridor straight to where concentrated oil and gas activities that were occurring by Shell, it would probably shoreline approach in Wainwright and then to try to get that to the Trans Alaska Pipe, you would have seen a corridor dissecting NPR-A in half about 60 to 80 miles southeast of Barrow.

And then probably look at Teshekpuk Herd model. Its movement, just like the Central Arctic Herd and potentially dissecting NPR-A from -- in two halves, and potentially making it unreasonable access policies to come to light that the Borough has, that you can't preclude reasonable subsistence user access to a subsistence resource where they are normally That's a policy of the Borough in land management. And that would be a major issue in the technical report that kind of looks at that, and say, is that pipeline corridor, either the pipeline should be all buried in the permafrost, or put that corridor on the coastline to where the animals' destination would already be for insect relief and core calving, and not 80 and 90 miles inland and dissecting that area, and potentially making it unreasonable for the most populated section on the North Slope, the most

populated area on the North Slope, from having reasonable access to those subsistence resources.

So long story short, I mean, that's -those are the types of concerns that some to mind, and
the need to sit down to -- with I think Secretary
Zinke's -- if you look at that language, it says, work
with local tribe -- work together now. Find better
ways of doing things.

21 22

And the outcry that we've had for 30 years about user conflicts, the availability of subsistence resources. And before the North Slope Borough does something, just like what we've done with bowhead whale and creating those policies, before we do that on land, I think it's important to find ways where we can work together, and find a reasonable solution, because we are working towards a comprehensive approach on the North Slope with comprehensive planning. And we are now getting ready to, once all the village comprehensive plans are done, update the entire North Slope Borough's comprehensive plan, the umbrella comprehensive plan with including all the village plans, which every one of these are describing their area of influence.

Anyway, long story short. But I think it's important to tell these kind of stories and talk, because, you know, there's always been kind of like OSM does its own stuff, ADF&G does its own stuff, and then we cry, you know. And that seems to be how its been.

MR. KLIMSTRA: Well, it sounds like there's an opportunity or potential for some research and collaboration in the future there.

 MS. AHTUANGARUAK: Gordon, you brought up the comprehensive plans and Nuiqsut doesn't have ours completed, and it's very important that the reasoning why Nuiqsut did not complete the comprehensive plan is that the Nuiqsut Paisangich (ph) has a better understanding with local involvement and control of some of the decision-making process, and the North Slope Borough's planning process removes that local control. And we haven't been able to update the plan that allows us to maintain the protections we have with the Nuiqsut Paisangich. And what we would lose with the new comprehensive planning effort through the North Slope Borough over some of those local control

issues.

1 2 3

4

5

6 7

8

9

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

It also leads to some of the development that we're dealing with in National Petroleum Reserve. When the area in this area was a conservation unit in our early planning efforts were protecting and some of the decision-making factors, and that is no longer a conservation unit. It's been changed to a development unit. Those protective mechanisms that were put in the early planning stages are not protective mechanisms that can be incorporated in this current planning stages, and that understanding needs to be translated into the future documents, because it affects the interpretation of the data that's incorporated throughout all of this data collection. And it affects the way that we're communicating some of our concerns, because we initially had that protective mechanism, but now that we don't have that protective mechanism, and now we're having State, Federal, and Borough government increasing the activities around our communities, it greatly impacts whether or not any of our efforts to put in measures to give us subsistence protections will or will not be available in this data interpretation.

242526

27

28

29 30

31

32

33 34

35

36

37

38

39

40 41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49 50

23

So these are all very important planning efforts as you're going through some of this discussion, but really working with our communities on this issue is instrumental, because we can take some of your data that you're putting forward in this discussion, just as we were upset about the number that you came up with when you put the '98 through 2016 data, or whatever it was on that slide. And then when we bring in our personal knowledge about those are not numbers that we're harvesting at, yet these are decision-making criteria that others are using to make land use decisions that are greatly impacting us. And it's this accumulation of information that facilitates project approval beyond the village's conflict. And that's -- our villages are being put in astronomical situations to try to defend in these situations. Protective mechanisms that we put in keep getting pulled back. And so all of these layers of protections affect the way that you're interpreting this data as well as historical data comparing to new data. And we're very, very concerned about this, and we question this process extensively. But we also worked very hard to try to maintain some of these protections, and yet the Borough and the State and the Federal governments

still are going against the community's concerns to protect our subsistence way of life, and approving more and more projects on these discussions.

3 4 5

6

7

8

9 10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

2425

2

So Gordon brought out the effort. Yes, we want to do some improvements around this comprehensive planning, but local control is instrumental for our communities to push and make others that are making decisions affecting our village subsistence harvest. It's really important that we have a better seat in this process to try to deal with some of these issues and complaints. Just as we asked for that satellite imagery, you know, if we get that imagery presented where we have key unit development and we look at that satellite imagery, it's a very different view than if you do your multiple years over time and rapidly show don't worry, you've still got animals moving through this area. So that kind of information, we really, you know, requested that we get some of this discussion, but yet you're back in another report and you're lumping this information together, and it's impacting us. And so I put that back out there that we're still very concerned about the way that the State is presenting this information, because the State is facilitating continuing to impact our subsistence way of life.

26 27 28

29

30

31

32

33 34

35

MR. KLIMSTRA: Thank you, Rosemary. And I guess again the thing that I'm just hearing over and over again is like we've got to have more accurate data here. And, you know, the best tool that we have available for this at this time is that RC 907. You know, this -- we can get at these things, you know We have that opportunity now. And so I hope that, you know, we can really make a difference for communities like Nuigsut with this permit.

36 37 38

39

40 41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

MS. AHTUANGARUAK: Also the reference to the Red Dog Mine and its studies, this is some data that could have been collected in the North Slope region with efforts to get support from the North Slope Borough and the State of Alaska to look at some of the impacts related to land use changes around Nuiqsut in the Prudhoe Bay region. We could have been collecting this data, but nobody allowed us to get it, and yet when we put all these complaints and concerns in there, the process for the Red Dog Mine did get some statistical data. And, yes, it is an issue about some of the changes that we're dealing with and in

```
Page 175
     interpreting that data, but it's our failure to get
     this data around the existing industrial field that is
 2
     not giving us resources to assess planning decisions
 3
 4
     around road and infrastructure development that gives
     us criteria that says maybe 500 acres of gravel
 5
     placement is much too impactful in key calving areas
 6
 7
     versus having a 14-acre plan that was presented when we
     started some of these discussions around Nuigsut.
 8
 9
10
                     CHAIRMAN BROWER:
                                       Thank you, Rosemary.
11
12
                     Any other questions on the ADF&G, the
     updates on caribou Western Arctic Herd and Teshekpuk
13
14
     Herd.
15
16
                     (No comments)
17
18
                     CHAIRMAN BROWER: Were you going to
19
     touch on Central or not?
20
                     MR. KLIMSTRA: I provided that handout
21
22
     to you. Unfortunately the Central Arctic Herd
23
     biologist had a conflict and couldn't be here.
     certainly relay questions. And I don't know if she's
24
25
     on the line.
26
                     MR. PATTON: Beth was on the line this
27
28
     morning.
29
30
                     MR. KLIMSTRA: Oh, okay. Beth, are you
     still on the line?
31
32
33
                     MS. PATTON: And maybe while
34
     you're....
35
                     MS. LENART: Hi, I am still on the line
36
     until 11, and then I'm -- and Jason, my assistant, is
37
     also on the line if for some reason we're in the middle
38
39
     of....
40
41
                     MR. KLIMSTRA: So if anybody's got any
     Central Arctic Herd questions.....
42
43
                     MS. LENART: .....something, and I need
44
     to take off. But I will be here until 11, so it would
45
     be great if you had a chance to look at that handout
46
     and had any questions for me.
47
48
                     MS. PATTON: So for the Council, that
49
```

Page 176 got distributed yesterday, and let me know if you..... 2 MR. KLIMSTRA: If you don't -- if you 3 4 need another one, I can provide another one here. 5 CHAIRMAN BROWER: Yeah, I was 6 7 interested to look at it. 8 MS. PATTON: It looks like this. 9 10 CHAIRMAN BROWER: Here it is, I guess. 11 12 MS. PATTON: Here you go. 13 14 15 MR. KLIMSTRA: I'm going to step away from the microphone. I've talked enough. I'm going to 16 let Beth handle Central Arctic Herd here. So thank you 17 18 for your time. 19 20 CHAIRMAN BROWER: Okay. Maybe just one question while you're there. Was there a count on 21 Central Arctic Herd using the digital equipment? 2.2. 23 MR. KLIMSTRA: Yeah, I'll let Beth take 24 25 that. She's got all that information for you. 26 27 CHAIRMAN BROWER: All right. Okay. 28 MS. LENART: Mr. Chair. 29 This is Beth 30 Lenart, Fish and Game, for the record. 31 CHAIRMAN BROWER: Yeah, go ahead, Beth. 32 33 34 MS. LENART: The count that we're using is from the digital photo census. We also conducted a 35 photo census using the film camera, because we weren't 36 sure we were going to be able to get to use the digital 37 There was a conflict with another herd. But 38 then conditions were good. And so the photo census 39 memo that I just sent out are the results from the 40 41 digital camera. 42 CHAIRMAN BROWER: All right. 43 questions for Beth on the handout. And I'm seeing a 44 whole bunch of confidence intervals and triangles with 45 -- what is that, Rivest -- some kind of confidence 46 level intervals. So what is -- if you could talk to us 47 about the sheet that was handed out, maybe starting off 48 with if there's any positive outlook on its growth, and 49

Page 177

if it's trending the same as the Central -- I mean the Teshekpuk and the Western Arctic Herd might be helpful.

MS. LENART: Mr. Chair. Yes, I can summarize that handout.

So for the Central Arctic Caribou Herd, our current population estimate is about 28,000 caribou which is higher than the 2016 estimate of about 23,000 caribou. So even though the number is higher, based on what you heard about the digital camera, and then based on some other demographic data that we've collected — for example, mortality rates were a little bit high during that year. Pregnancy rates were good. But in general I think that that herd is closer to stability rather than growing. So even though on the graph it looks like the number is higher, based on some of the mortality rates we had of adult females, I think the herd was probably closer to being stable.

CHAIRMAN BROWER: And the actual count, is 26,000 the estimate with that plus and minus, and there was also what Ryan talked about, was the minimum count, what was actually counted?

MS. LENART: Correct. Well, the estimate was closer to 28,000 and then it's plus or minus a few thousand caribou. And so that uncertainty is captured in caribou that we didn't capture in photographs, so we counted a minimum of -- let me see. We counted a minimum of 27,000 caribou. So basically that, you know, incorporating some statistics, it's added another thousand caribou, so those were caribou that we probably didn't observe that were on the landscape. Does that make sense?

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Yeah, I think it does after, you know, listening to Ryan explanation of things. And, you know, we have historical highs of herd size, and then the management scheme based on some of those trends. So when was the Central Arctic Herd historical highs? I mean, are those decades and decades ago, or are they recent? I've heard as much as 55,000 animals to 60, 70,000 animals in the period of time that I've had to be -- have had the pleasure of serving here over the course of, you know, several decades anyway.

MS. LENART: Mr. Chair. The Central

Arctic Herd was identified in 1978 at about 5,000 caribou. And then it increased and then it peaked at about 70,000 caribou in 2010. So for a couple of years there it was 60 to 70,000 caribou. And then it declined in 2013. If you recall, in 2013, that was a really hard spring on a lot of animals on the North Slope. And then it continued to decline sharply in 2016. And now we think it's about stable in 2017.

8 9 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

2

3 4

5

6 7

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Thank you. I think those were -- I think it's important just to look at what the herd strengths has been and where it's gone and where it's come back from. And it seems to me -- you know, I think last year we were hearing that they going -- they were trending towards below 20,000 is what I heard, and it's good to see then an actual count of 27,000. That would be the minimum count; that's the actual count

18 19 20

MS. LENART: Mr. Chair, I agree. I was glad to see the same thing.

212223

2425

26

27

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Yeah. And that's using the digital equipment and supplemented by the film. And did those two coincide or was it one worked to support the other, or were they mirroring in approach, or what's the story on that?

28 29 30

31

32

33 34

35

36

37 38

39 40

41

42

43

44

45

46 47

48

49 50

MS. LENART: Well, the difference between the -- so the film camera photo census occurred the day before the photo census that we did with the digital camera. And it was -- we did that one, because we didn't know if we would be able to get the digital camera to the North Slope in time before the caribou aggregation broke up. So it's a separate census. Those number are -- I'm still working on those numbers, but right now the preliminary data indicate that those numbers are similar to last year's film census, around 23,000 caribou. And so that's -- and so I'm kind of working on a memo with comparing that to the digital. The issue with the film census on that day was there was some caribou movement, and so it's harder to capture exactly what's going on, because you have overlapping photos, and trying -- and when caribou movement occurs, that makes it a little more challenging. And so that's one of the benefits of the digital camera is that we could take one photo -- just one photo of a group of caribou. And so I'm not using them necessarily together I guess, because that was

```
2
```

part of your question.

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Thank you. That's the kind of -- just was information I wanted to hear.

Any questions for Beth from any of the Council members.

MR. SIKVAYUGAK: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Jerry from Anaktuvuk.

MR. SIKVAYUGAK: Yes. Beth, I see your numbers here that the demographic metrics collected. And from '79, '80, and there's some years that aren't counted. And why is that?

21 22

MS. LENART: Through the Chair. Yeah, that is because in some years those caribou weren't aggregated well enough to take photos either due to poor weather conditions, or due to lack of insects. And in some years they were just too mixed with the Porcupine Caribou Herd to do a photo census. So there was a long stretch between 2002 and 2008 when we did not get a photo census when it appears that that herd was increasing.

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Jerry, did that answer your question?

MR. SIKVAYUGAK: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Any other questions for Beth on Central Arctic Herd.

MS. AHTUANGARUAK: In Nuiqsut we put a lot of communication about the concern to this herd and the changes that were increasing access by other hunters through the Dalton Highway. We've also put in a lot of concern that there's more people bringing up boats to access different waterways in the Arctic and concerns about how that is impacting migration, especially to the Village of Anaktuvuk, between Nuiqsut and Anaktuvuk. Are we going to be able to get some of that information and to assess some of these discussion with any research efforts related to this herd.

MS. LENART: Through the Chair. Rosemary, so we have some caribou movements, but it's

challenging to try to determine if hunters or vehicles along the road or boats are deflecting those movements. But I think I have some satellite collar data now that I could at least map some of those movements and relay that information. As far as trying to figure out how to do that kind of study, so far it's been challenging.

6 7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24 25

26

27

28

2

3

4

5

MS. AHTUANGARUAK: Yeah, we're -definitely those are some important factors that we're trying to hope in understanding the changes to the various herds and what are some of the risk factors to population growth and contributing actors, but this has been a very big issue with all of our herds and their migrations and discussions with Nuigsut and Anaktuvuk. And we've been working for decades to try to build the understanding of what's happening, but we definitely need data to help us in interpreting that. But we also need to be involved with others who are interpreting that data so that when we're on the ground and we have hunters that come up the Dalton Highway and they pass 38 hunters along their way to traveling back to our village that, you know, some of that information is being recorded, because we know it's not being collected through the State and Federal government. But we have put efforts into restrict some of these activities, but if we don't have the data sets to help us understand it, those are protective mechanisms to consider to continue to use to improve these populations.

29 30 31

32

33 34

35

36

37 38

39 40

41

42

43

Those are very important pieces of information that could affect some of these decisions as well as when we're reacting to others making decisions to approve projects. And we're bringing these concerns forward just as Anaktuvuk brought the concern about the population harvest, because it was layered from so many years of information. But when we separated out to specific years or unit development, that's a very different interpretation of the data. So we've been pushing to try to get some of this. We definitely want to continue to work with Anaktuvuk in this interpretation of this data, but also working with all that are dealing with trying to understand what's happening to our population of the herds.

44 45 46

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Thank you, Rosemary.

47 48

MS. LENART: Through the Chair. Rosemary, I hear you, and I have heard that in the

past, too, and so I'm not trying to ignore it. So I'm glad to hear you say it again, and that you guys are actually, you know, trying to do some things on your end with recording information. And so as I get a little bit closer then maybe I can touch base with you, as I get a little bit closer getting some of that data together.

7 8 9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

2

3 4

5

6

MS. AHTUANGARUAK: Yeah. That's great. We would definitely love to work with it as well as sharing the discussion between Nuiqsut and Anaktuvuk, because we're both trying to protect both our villages and the changes that are coming. But we have tremendous amount of concern with others that want to change our lands and waters and could impact whether or not the migrations continue to make kit to our community. So these are really important issues that we're putting forward, but it's difficult to get the appropriateness of the response when others control whether or not we have the resources to obtain the data that we're requesting

212223

MS. LENART: Okay.

24 25

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Any other questions to Beth on the Central Arctic Herd data sheet.

26 27 28

MR. KAYOTUK: Mr. Chair.

29 30

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Yeah. Go ahead, Lee.

31 32 33

34

35

36

37 38

39

40 41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

MR. KAYOTUK: Yeah, we've got the same problem in our area, too, you know. We had a meeting last month with -- I sit on a board with Native Village of Kaktovik, and we're looking really closely about the caribou patterns and migration and, you know, it's been coming up that, you know, the tourists and like say by the Canadian border which is a tent city place that rafters and tourists are, you know. We heard that people are following the caribou, and, you know, wow, let's go follow the caribou, you know. We'll fly out somebody there and drop them off and, you know, you're going to have people that put them in the caribou that didn't probably I want to say change their migration pattern towards more of the south because of the Porcupine Caribou that didn't come around for a few years, and, you know, that we're looking closely into about, you know, how the tourism rafters are -- could be affecting in our area.

1 Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Thank you, Lee.

Any other questions for Beth.

MS. AHTUANGARUAK: Yeah, one more

question.

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Rosemary.

MS. AHTUANGARUAK: With the designation of the Dalton Highway to become a scenic byways, there has been a change in some of the usage on this area with increasing outsiders bringing in large groups into various areas doing float trips or doing tours with large numbers of groups. Some of these outfitters that are doing that kind of stuff. Have we collected any of the data around that designation in that changing land use that's coming from that designation.

MS. LENART: Through the Chair. This is Beth Lenart.

I have not collected any of that data, Rosemary. Most of what I have is hunter information. I'm not sure how to get at that. I know a little bit of way to get at that through the visitor's center along the Dalton Highway, and so maybe they have some data on especially trends through time on how many tourists or whatever are going up the road, so that might be a way to get some of that information.

MS. AHTUANGARUAK: Yeah, if we can work to collect some of that information, it is a definite change in some of the decision-making criteria, but it also is in the concentration of different user conflicts that are occurring. We've had different people that use the motorcycles and come up with groups and doing some of that travel. We've had bikers coming through and doing some of that travel. But we also have various caravans with the campers and they're -- those kind of things can be very impactful, as well as some of these float trips that are occurring, and looking at how that is contributing to some of the discussions that we're having. It's very important if we're not getting all of that various layers of data.

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Thank you, Rosemary

 Page 183

MS. LENART: A good point actually.

2
3 CHAIRMAN BROWER: Thank you, Rosemary.
4 Any other questions for Beth on the Central Arctic. We have Vince.

 $$\operatorname{MR}.$ MATHEWS: Thank you. Vince Mathews with the three refuges.

I've been at the Arctic Interagency Visitors Center the past two summers, and I'll be up there this summer. I haven't looked at all the data over the years, but please realize the Arctic Interagency Visitor Center data is as they come in the door, we count them. So they have to elect to come in. It's not a track station.

Based just on memory, last year the data was a little lower, but not low enough to be a concern, compared to last years.

So I will be up there again and interfacing this time all the way through into September.

I talked to other staff there. We did see a little bit more of hunters coming into the visitors center compared to the past. They generally are focused to get to their location, and then leave. So I don't want to have you guys, you know, focus on that data too closely. And then Beth brought up the visitors service data.

And since I'm up at the mic, I'm really pleased with your discussion on hunter harvest. I'm involved with waterfowl harvest surveys across the Interior, and we have good participation in that. And Lee knows this, also I'll be part of the writing team looking at ways to improve harvest data on the Porcupine Caribou Herd on the U.S. side, so I'm hoping to get more up to speed how they do it on the Canadian side. So your whole discussion on the need for participation is very timely for me.

And in respect to the past Chair of Western Interior, Ron Sam, who passed away a few years ago, we were working on -- that's why I have all this gray hair, we were working on a Western Interior issue on moose for, gosh, I can't remember, five, six years.

And then once Ron pounded on the table saying, villages need to report accurately. Then that decision took a different path that resulted in solutions both at the Board of Game level and the Federal level. But people had to step up and report. And I know very well the resistance on reporting.

6 7 8

9

10

2

3

4

5

So I will be using your transcript when I run into people that have concerns on it. I would encourage you guys to make strong statements to your communities on the need for accurate reporting.

11 12 13

So anyways, I appreciate that

14 15 discussion.

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Thank you, Vince.

16 17 18

19

Any other questions to Beth before we let her go on the Central Arctic Herd worksheet that she provided and her explanation.

20 21 22

Go ahead, Rosemary.

23 24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33 34

35

36

37 38

39

MS. AHTUANGARUAK: It is also important that in our region we've gone through years where we've had increased research efforts with multiple entities collecting data, and how that impacts the various reporting that's occurring. We dealt with ConocoPhillips and we dealt with Shell. Then we dealt with the International Polar Year, and all these different research efforts that are occurring out there, but on those years that we have an increased concentration of research efforts with multiple species being researched by multiple entities, it does impact the way that some of this information is being accumulated. Is there any effort to show some of that information and have the data as being collected, and whether or not some of the crossover of flight patterns and research data collection is impacting whether or not we're getting the data that we should be getting.

40 41 42

43

44

45

46 47

48

MS. LENART: Through the Chair.
Rosemary, that -- I'm really glad you brought that up.
I just had a meeting with Todd Brinkman, UAF, who's
done some research in your area. And he mentioned that
he thought that Nuiqsut was the most surveyed routinely
village on the entire North Slope. And he made it, you
know, very evident that there were lots of research
going on and lots of surveys. And so that is one of

the things that we are aware of that everybody's coming and pounding on your door looking for information. And so that is definitely something that we're aware of. I don't know how to move forward from that, but we do take that into consideration.

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Thank you, Beth.

Any other questions.

MR. OOMITTUK: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Go ahead there,

Steve, from Point Hope.

MR. OOMITTUK: Yeah. You know, how far south does your Central Arctic Herd migrate? Is there, you know -- you know, the Ambler Mining District access project that's coming up, are they in that area? Will they migrate that far south?

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Did we lose Beth. We must have lost Beth, but to my knowledge, yeah, they do go beyond the Borough boundaries to the south, and.....

MS. LENART: Mr. Chair, I just had my

mute on.

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Oh, okay. There you are. Okay, I was going to answer for you, but.....

MS LENART: Yeah. So they don't normally go over by the Ambler District, but they do go to the south side of Brooks Range. And as far south as they have gone, I don't know if you're familiar with the Chandalar River just east of the Haul Road and the northern side of Hodzana Hills, they have gone that far south since I've been looking at them.

MR. OOMITTUK: All right. Thank you. You know, because we had some concerns about the Western Arctic Caribou Herd, you know, that they ago south on that side. You know, I don't know too much about the east coast.

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Thank you, Steve. I hope that was helpful.

MR. OOMITTUK: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Any other questions

2 for Beth.

(No comments)

4 5 6

7

8

9

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Hearing none, we're going to wrap up with the caribou updates and go into the second part of old business, and that was to take up special action review relevance. Maybe you can point us in the right direction there, Eva.

10 11 12

13

14

MS. PATTON: Mr. Chair and Council. And if I may, I want to make sure Beth had her chance to speak just in regards to the Western Arctic Caribou Herd and Teshekpuk Herd and the registration permit.

15 16 17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24 25

26

27

28

29 30

31

32

33 34

35

36

37

38

39

Since we have new Council members whose this is your first meeting, a little bit of background. The State passed the registration permit for caribou under State hunting regulations. There was a proposal that was submitted to the Federal Subsistence Board. At the last meeting this Council reviewed that proposal, and it would, if passed by the Board, enact a registration permit for the hunting of caribou on Federal lands under Federal subsistence regulations as well. And so for hunting on Federal lands, Anaktuvuk Pass in the park system, or as Wainwright had noted, they are most often hunting on BLM lands for caribou. So if that passes by the Board, which is meeting in April, and the Council Chair will be participating in that and referring the Council's recommendation was to support that request that request for harvest registration permit. But that would address Anaktuvuk Pass both in tribal consultation and in the Council meetings here, that concern of not having accurate harvest data, and not having current harvest data, and that concern that the low harvest in recent years isn't reflected, because currently it's a community harvest survey that's done, and that can only occur because of budgets every several years or so.

40 41 42

43

44

45

46

47

48

So we did put a request for Beth Mekow to present on the community harvest data that has been — has taken place so far in Anaktuvuk Pass and other communities in the region, but we will keep this Council and the communities apprised of the Board's decision, and if that Federal subsistence permit goes through as well, a lot of communications and feedback with the communities on how that interacts with Federal

subsistence harvest.

So I just wanted to add that.

We have new Council members to kind of bring up to speed there.

So this proposal also came -- the proposal that is coming before the Council, if the Council wishes to reconsider it, came before this Council at the fall meeting. This proposal was addressing Unit 23 closure, and was submitted by the Western Arctic Caribou Herd Working Group. The Council took action on this proposal, and you can find in your meeting minutes a summary of the Council's action, the vote, and the justification. And that's on Page 12 in your meeting minutes. We have -- because that was, you know, several month ago, and also again we have new Council members.

2.2

So we do have Josh here who can provide, you know, an overview of the analysis, the new information. Again it was the Staff to the Federal Subsistence Board that had requested that all Councils within the range of the Western Arctic Caribou Herd have an opportunity to reconsider this if they so wished based on new caribou data that was available, and the action of the Western Arctic Caribou Herd at their December meeting. So Josh can provide background and update for you, but just a little background, because we have new folks that weren't part of the process in the fall.

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Yeah. Before I recognize Josh, maybe it would be important to go ahead and just read that portion of our minutes, because there are folks that are new that weren't part of the voting that went on and the deliberation and discussions. I think that's the WP18-46/47.

MS. PATTON: Yes. And when there are two proposals like that, because sometimes there are proposals submitted to the Federal Subsistence Board that are very similar or identical, submitted by two different entities and so they're combined together. And so -- and again, because this is the Council's recommendation, but we don't have, you know, the synopsis. Essentially the request was to close Federal lands in Unit 23 to the hunting of caribou to only

Federally-qualified subsistence users. So it means non-Federally-qualified users would, if passed, not be allowed to hunt for caribou on Federal lands. And just in Unit 23.

And this Council takes up proposals in Unit 23 in part because C&T for the Western Arctic Caribou herd throughout the range, and point is in Unit 23. And so this Council makes recommendations even when it's, you know, outside of Unit 26A and the North Slope region.

So the Council had responded to that request for closure, and again that proposal was submitted by the Western Arctic Caribou Herd. And it was noted that the impacts of aircrafts, so it was addressing user conflicts as well in the region, to bring in non-local hunters affects the -- oop. We have a -- I've got a typo here, so let me pull this up. Just a minute here and I'll pull up the full recommendation here.

 CHAIRMAN BROWER: So the discussion and justifications are just above the vote. It's right there. The vote, 7 for to zero. Nobody abstained.

MS. PATTON: Yeah. So the vote was -so there was -- the Council was taking action -- just
trying to clarify, the Council was taking action on
Proposal 18-46. And five Council members supported 1846 as written, and two were opposed, and then took no
action on WP18-47. It's a little hard, because we're
kind of coming out of the process that we usually take
to provide an analysis first. No action on 47 because
the action taken on the prior proposal covered 47.

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Then why does it have vote 7 for and against zero and abstained zero?

MS. PATTON: So you'll see it's five voted for WP18-46 as written, and two against.

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Right. Right. And then right underneath of that, take no action, but there's a vote number there that says for seven and against zero.

MS. PATTON: Right. So the Council voted on Proposal 18-46, including the nay votes. And

then took no action on 47. So the nay votes were still taking action on 46.

2 3 4

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Okay.

5

7

8

MS. PATTON: And I apologize. It's a little difficult to go back and refer -- I don't know if it would be helpful just for a little background reference on the two proposals.

9 10 11

Or would you like me just.....

12 13

14 15

16

17

18

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Yeah. Eva, it's just -- you know, I think it's important for us, because when time elapse and then you're talking about reconsideration, what did we do back then, especially when people change, and then to reinterpret what happened and to try to refresh our memory. I want to make sure it's accurate, and then....

19 20 21

22 23

24 25

26

27

28

29 30

31

32

33 34

35

36

37

38

39

40 41

42

MS. PATTON: Yeah, absolutely. agree, and that's why I can read the Council's justification, but it was in regards to the actual proposal, and so it might be hard to recall what each proposal was without a refresher. And so I'm just referring to proposal numbers here, and the Council noted that impacts from aircrafts used to bring in nonlocal hunters affect the animal migration routes and ability of locals to hunt. The Council feels the aircraft operators desire to place paying clients in the path of the caribou are diverting caribou and preventing local communities from being able to get caribou. The Council stressed that even though the closure may deflect non-Federally-qualified subsistence users to State lands, it's important to take steps to provide an opportunity for subsistence users on Federal lands. And the Council noted this conflict has been going on in this area for many years, and so this is Unit 23, and a lot of discussion around the Squirrel River area in particular. But it seems up until this point the transporters and guides have not shown any inclination to self-regulate and work with local users and resolve the conflict.

43 44 45

46

47

48

It was noted that the WACH Working Group, the Western Arctic Caribou Herd Working Group, represents a broad variety of communities and user groups, and that this proposal is the voice of people from the region. As such, the Council supports this

request.

So again this proposal was submitted by the Western Arctic Caribou Herd Work Group, and their request was to close Federal lands in Unit 23 to the hunting of caribou to non-Federally-qualified users. So only Federally-qualified subsistence users could hunt. And so the Council supported that request.

There was a lot of discussion, there was an amendment to the proposal that was suggested that would hone in that closure just in the intense user conflict areas. We do have the analysis. Again I agree it's a little difficult to go back and revisit this without providing kind of the context for the action that the Council took. So the Council had discussion about those possible amendments. They recognized the work that went into evaluating the area, so there were some maps.

2.2

And we do have some handouts that give a brief synopsis, and that might be helpful to follow along with, too.

So the Council was addressing the suggestions to hone in on a very specific closure where the most intense user conflicts were, and they recognized the work that went into evaluating these areas of most importance to local communities for the harvest of caribou, and that are the site of the most user intense conflicts in the area, but did not support the OSM modification which was that suggestion to hone in on the user conflict area for the closure.

The Council feels that the local harvest is already consuming the harvestable surplus. Communities are growing and perhaps it is time to go into preservation mode. It was noted, however, that it appeared that the OSM modification reflected that those areas were the real problem area for user conflicts.

Chairman Gordon Brower commended the work that went into identifying that specific area as the most critical for local subsistence hunters, and that it has been at the heart of user conflicts in the region for many years, and recognized the effort to find a solution that could be supported by all.

Overall again the Council supported the

original proposal as submitted by the Western Arctic Caribou Herd Working Group which was to close all Federal lands to Federally-qualified subsistence users.

And we do have -- Josh has compiled a handout that helps to summarize some of the new data and also have those maps that were suggested in the modification. One of the reasons the InterAgency Staff Committee, the Staff to the Board, requested that this proposal come back before the Council was additional caribou data, but also that the Western Arctic Caribou Herd Working Group that had submitted the proposal took action on this and amended their own proposal. So that was the request for it to come back to the Council. And we can hand that out that shows the Western Arctic Caribou's action.

And, again, it's at the wish of the Council if you want to revisit and make a different recommendation.

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Thank you, Eva.

And I'll recognize Josh.

MR. REAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair and members of the Council. For the record my name is Joshua Ream. I'm an anthropologist with the Office of Subsistence Management.

I did hand out that overview. It's a one pager that includes the new information, both the biological information, much of which Ryan went over with you this morning, as well as some of the actions of the Western Arctic Caribou Herd Working Group. So you can just look through that while I sort of walk you through it here in this presentation.

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Yeah, Josh, what does the paper look like?

MR. REAM: It has two maps on the back of it, two color maps. Just one page. It may be sitting on the desk there. I have other copies, too.

So since your Council met last fall, there has been the new information that's emerged on the caribou herd. I'm going to share this information with you and present your Council with the opportunity

to either maintain or to change your recommendation in Wildlife Proposals WP18-46 and 18-47.

To review, Proposal 18-46 was submitted by the by the Western Arctic Caribou Herd Working Group as Eva mentioned. And Proposal WP18-47 was submitted by Enoch Mitchell of Noatak. And they request that Federal Public lands in Unit 23 be closed to caribou hunting except by Federally-qualified subsistence users. WP18-47 also requests that the closure extend for two years only. And that would be July 1st, 2018 through June 30th of 2020.

The new biological information provided by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game is depicted in Table 1 of your handout, and this includes the 2017 Western Arctic Caribou Herd population estimate of 259,000 caribou.

21 22

The WACH Working Group also voted to change the status of the Western Arctic Herd to conservative stable at their 2017 meeting. While population numbers alone indicate liberal management, the Working Group supported maintaining conservative management due to the use of new technology, specifically the digital cameras, and completing the 2017 population counts, and because a large proportion of the herd is young caribou that are still vulnerable to harsh winters.

The Working Group also voted to modify their own proposal, WP18-46 at their 2017 meeting. The group voted to support the 2017/2018 targeted closure for two years only. This area is depicted in map 1 on the back of your handout.

These handouts are also on the side for anyone else in the room that would like to look at this.

The Working Group supported the 2017/2018 closure area as it was limited to Federal public lands where user conflicts have been greatest in past years while maintaining access for non-Federally-qualified users to the other Federal lands in Unit 23.

In conclusion, we just wanted to make you aware of this new information, and to provide the Council with an opportunity to change or to maintain

Page 193 your recommendation for both WP18-46 and 47 given the new information. Recommendation options are listed at 2 the bottom of your handout. Any change to the 3 4 Council's recommendation requires a motion and a vote and will be conveyed to the Federal Subsistence Board 5 before the Board deliberates on these proposals. 6 7 8 Thank you for your time. 9 10 I'll be happy to answer any questions. 11 CHAIRMAN BROWER: Questions for Josh on 12 new information provided for WP18-46, 47, Unit 23 13 caribou closure proposal. 14 15 (No comments) 16 17 CHAIRMAN BROWER: 18 I've got a question 19 here. The WACH, that's the Western Arctic Caribou Working Group? Is that when you say WACH? 20 21 2.2 MR. REAM: Yes, sir. 23 CHAIRMAN BROWER: And that group is 24 comprised -- I've heard that it's a large group, right? 25 And it comprises of users that the herd gracefully 26 meets to these communities, and those communities that 27 are users of the herd. And so can you describe the 28 WACH group for a little bit? 29 30 MR. REAM: Sure. And I don't know if 31 Eva has it on hand, but last time we had read the 32 membership of that group. It is quite large, and it 33 34 includes members from a variety of different 35 communities and user groups. So I'll just take a moment here to see if we can find that description if 36 you'd like to hear..... 37 38 MS. PATTON: It's in the..... 39 40 41 CHAIRMAN BROWER: Yeah, if you could say the -- is it a culmination of 38 villages that 42 comprise the Western Arctic Working Group, or what is 43 Is it four villages, or what is it? 44 45

46 47 48

49 50 MS. PATTON: The breakdown....

REPORTER: Eva, by a mic, please.

```
MS. PATTON: Okay. Mr. Council and
 1
     Chair. So the Western Arctic Caribou Herd Working
 2
     Group is quite a large working group, and it has
 3
 4
     representatives, and these are the voting
     representatives serving on the working group. Usually
 5
     ADF&G, the state biologists are involved, the Federal
 6
 7
     land managers within the region are involved.
     voting chairs you'll see in the back of the paper.
 8
 9
     There's ACs involved, and representatives, communities
10
     are broken into groups. And so you'll see there's a
11
     series of groups that are listed, and there's usually
     one representative from that series of communities. So
12
     there are several Council members that are members of
13
     the Caribou Working Group. Steve Oomittuk represents
14
15
     the Point Hope region. Esther Hugo is appointed for
     the Anaktuvuk Pass and Nuigsut region. And then Wanda
16
     Kippi is an alternate for the area that includes
17
18
               So there are several Council members that
     serve as voting members on the Western Arctic Caribou
19
     Herd Working Group. So they have communities
20
     throughout the region. There's conservationists,
21
2.2
     there's Reindeer Herders Association, there's
23
     transporters, there's hunting guides, Fairbanks
     hunters. And again ADF&G is the organizer, and the
24
25
     following agencies that support the working group.
     ADF&G and then all the land management agencies within
26
     the range of the Western Arctic Caribou Herd, which is
27
     BLM, National Park Service, and Fish and Wildlife
28
29
     Service.
```

30 31

32

33 34

35

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Thank you, Eva. And it's good, because -- it's good for me to understand the group's makeup. And when we're starting to look at recommendations and changes and who-all's proposing that in the wake of the movement of the Western Arctic Caribou Herd.

36 37 38

39

40 41 The second follow-up question I had, how divided are these people? How divided is this group in terms of nay or yeah in terms of the recommendations that are up for reconsideration? Is it 50/50. Is it 60/40. Is it 90/10.

46

MR. REAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I apologize. I do not know what the vote was, but perhaps one of the members present that were at that meeting could allude to that information.

47 48 49

MS. PATTON: Mr. Chair and Council.

Yeah, my apologies. We don't have the exact vote. They function in the same way that a majority vote pass — the same way as the Council, that a majority vote passes the motion. You know, I think it depends given on the issue at hand that they vote on, that it varies what the overall vote is.

I don't know if we have anybody that has access to the internet that might know what that -- the exact vote was. But again it passed on a majority vote.

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Yeah, thank you, Eva. And who from the Council if I may ask attended.....

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chair. Or is somebody else going to speak up? Go ahead.

 MS. ATKINSON: This is Hannah Atkinson. I have the meeting summary from the Western Arctic Caribou Herd Working Group with the results from that vote on WP18-46, If you want that information.

 CHAIRMAN BROWER: Thank you. If you could provide that. We're just trying to understand, you know, what's going on here, and just would like to see the level of support for the recommendations that are -- if we wanted to take up any changes to what we did in the fall meeting.

MS. ATKINSON: So the numbers on the meeting summary, it was they approved of WP18-46 as it was modified, and the amendment was approved nine yeas and six nays.

 And then another thing that I thought would help people understand the discussion that went on at the Western Arctic Caribou Herd Working Group, when you were asking about representation on that working group, that I was going to point out that Enoch Mitchell is the representative for Noatak, the Community of Noatak, that has been very vocal on this issue of Federal closures, and he was involved in all of this discussion that they had on WP18-46. And maybe Wanda remembers or Esther. I'm not sure if Esther was there, but maybe you remember some of the discussion that went on.

Page 196 MS. PATTON: Mr. Chair and Council. Both Steve Oomittuk and Esther.... 2 3 4 MS. KIPPI: Hello, this is Wanda. 5 6 MS. PATTON:were from.... 7 8 CHAIRMAN BROWER: Go ahead, Wanda. 9 10 MS. KIPPI: Yeah. On this action there 11 was -- I had written no action and it was approved. 12 CHAIRMAN BROWER: Maybe I'm 13 misunderstanding. On the Western Arctic Working Group 14 that you went to the Working Group meeting..... 15 16 MS. KIPPI: Oh, wait a minute. 17 looking at the wrong one. 47. I can't find 46. 18 on. I'm going to go back on hold and look at it again. 19 20 MR. DEWITT: Mr. Chair. 21 2.2 23 CHAIRMAN BROWER: Yeah, go ahead there. Is that Brian? 24 25 MR. DEWITT: No, this Neil DeWitt. I 26 actually sit on the Western Arctic Caribou Herd, and 27 during that meeting the action taken on 46, I was 28 against. And the reason I was against it, I wanted to 29 talk public testimony. I had a letter I was going to 30 read into the record. If you want to hear that now, I 31 could tell you real quick. 32 33 34 CHAIRMAN BROWER: I think it would be 35 prudent, because I'm not too sure if we're going to take up any changes to this, but I think gathering 36 information, it's going to sway what we do here. And I 37 38 think it's important to make informed decisions. I'm going to allow that. 39 40 41 MR. DEWITT: Okay, sir. This is what I wrote. My name's Neil DeWitt. I'm pleased that you're 42 listening to me, but I'm speaking on my own behalf, not 43 as a person on the chair -- or on the Working Group. 44 45 During the Arctic Western Caribou Herd 46 47 meeting in December, I spoke to reopen the caribou hunt to all Alaskans. With the numbers that Fish and Game 48 gave us at that time, is way more than enough to let 49

everybody use this resource. The rest of the people that are not in that area or the rest of the Lower 48 only make up five percent, and the maximum take ever on record at this time was 800 caribou. If you take the non-Federally-qualified subsistence users, the herd would still have -- or if you took that 800 out of the rest of the folks here, the herd would still have more than 16,000 extra animals that's added to the herd with the new numbers that we got.

The meeting that we had last year, the numbers were 108 -- or, I'm sorry, 198,203 animals. I'm sorry, let me restart. There was 198,000 to 203,000 is what the numbers were. This year we had 239 to 259,000 animals. So I see no question why the rest of Alaska or the Lower 48 could not use these animals or participate in this hunt. I say open it up to Alaska and the rest of the folks that are non-Federally-qualified subsistence users.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BROWER: And, Neil, before I let Neil go, and I appreciate your testimony, were you present during the Western Arctic Working Group's meeting and provided that?

 MR. DEWITT: Yes, sir. I sit on the Anchorage AC and I have one chair that's on the Western Arctic Caribou Herd because of that position. And I was there for the last three years actually.

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Yeah. Thank you,

Neil.

 $$\operatorname{And}$ I'm going to recognize Steve Oomittuk from Point Hope.

MR. OOMITTUK: Yeah, thank you.

MR. DEWITT: Thank you, sir.

MR. OOMITTUK: I also sit on the Western Arctic Caribou Herd Working Group, but I was not at that meeting. Due to health reasons, I did not travel.

But in the past, you know, the reason we closed it to non-Federally -- well, to non-residents

Thanks,

Page 198

```
was the first time, because, you know, on Federal
     lands. I mean, they could still come and hunt the
 2
     Western Arctic Caribou Herd, but not on Federal lands.
 3
 4
     They can put -- too many of the hunters were being
     dropped off in front of the herd before they migrate
 5
     south to the villages, and that had been changed -- you
 6
     know, that's been happening for years and years, and
 7
     the migration route of the Western Arctic Caribou Herd
 8
     was changing and not coming to the normal villages.
 9
10
     Since the closer, the migration of the caribou have
11
     been coming back. And, you know, since the population
     had dropped by more than half, which now they have new
12
     numbers that it's still -- you know, 500,000 was the
13
     high, 259,000 is just over half of what it used to be.
14
15
     And they're not closing to hunters Outside, you know,
     they could still hunt, they've just got to go on State
16
     land and hunt which is further south. And especially
17
     in Unit 23 they can be put in front of the herd.
18
     you know, that was our biggest concern was where they
19
     were going hunting before the migration started coming
20
     south and changing those routes.
21
22
```

But I wasn't at the meeting. They just recently picked an alternate in Point Hope I think.

Steve.

MR. SIKVAYUGAK: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN BROWER: All right.

28 29 30

31

23

242526

27

CHAIRMAN BROWER: I'm going to recognize Jerry from Anaktuvuk Pass.

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

MR. SIKVAYUGAK: Yes. On the issues, Proposal WP18-46, submitted by the Western Arctic Caribou Herd Working Group, and Proposal WP18-47, submitted by Enoch Mitchell of Noatak, request that Federal public lands in Unit 23 be closed to caribou hunting except by Federally-qualified subsistence users. WP18-47 also requests that the closure extend for two years only, July 1st, 2018 to June 30, 2020. And does that include the Central also and also Unit 23? Is that -- am I correct?

43 44 45

46

47

48

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Mr. Sikvayugak from AKP, maybe I'm not exactly understanding the question. I think the closure that was requested by the Western Arctic Working Group at the time was to do a closure of all Federal lands in Unit 23 only.

MR. SIKVAYUGAK: And not Central?

1 2 3

MS. PATTON: Mr. Chair and Council. I may be able to address that.

4 5 6

7

8

9 10 CHAIRMAN BROWER: I think it's the land. It's not based on -- if the Central Arctic Herd went into Unit 23 and hung out over there, I think the law would still, if it were enacted, would -- unless it had a sign on it, hey, we're Central Herd, kill us, you know.

11 12 13

14 15

16

17

18

MS. PATTON: Yeah. Under the Federal regulations, Federal subsistence regulations, it would be a closure to the hunting of caribou on those Federal public lands. So if it happened that there was another herd -- but I don't think the Central Arctic Herd's ranges that far into Unit 23. So mostly it's Western Arctic Caribou Herd that would be in that Unit 23 area.

19 20 21

2.2

23

24 25

26

27

28

29 30

31

32

33 34

35

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Yeah, I hope that cleared it up there, Jerry. If different herds -- you know, once in a while we've seen the Teshekpuk Herd jump over the Brooks Range and run away over there and go fiddle around in some other country. And if they get to be hunted over there. And I think the laws would apply, because they're just caribou. And if the law said that there was no hunting allowed for non-Federally-qualified users, they wouldn't be able to hunt that herd, just because it's in that area. But if they jumped over to the other side where it's allowed, the Western Arctic Herd would -- you know, it grazes Unit 26A and Unit 23, so if the herd were to move over to 26A or in Unit 26, the hunting pressure would still be there. So I think it's based on the unit is what it is.

36 37 38

MR. SIKVAYUGAK: Okay. Thank you.

39 40

41

42

43

44

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Additional questions. I was going to see if Wanda from Atqasuk had maybe accounts of what she saw in terms of the Western Arctic Working Group's decision. And it looks like there was nine for the modification and six against, or something to that effect.

45 46 47

Wanda, did you want to chime in.

48 49

MS. KIPPI: I was looking at the wrong

```
2
```

one. So the -- for the WP18-46 there was a motion to amend 18-46 with a map of 17-03 and it's on one of these pages that I have, with 13 yeas and two nays.

CHAIRMAN BROWER: So 13 yeas, 2 nays to amend and use the map that curtailed it to almost it looks like a village area of influence area.

MS. KIPPI: Uh-huh.

CHAIRMAN BROWER: That's certainly helpful. Is there anything else you wanted to add to the dialogue there, Wanda.

MS. KIPPI: Let me see. And it said support as written, that's what I had written down. Closure. The closure's going to be last for about two years with modifications I think. That's what I had written.

2.2

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Thank you. And there's Ryan from ADF&G. I'm pretty sure he's got some good information as well.

MR. KLIMSTRA: Yeah, Wanda nailed it there. That's correct. It was passed for two years.

MS. KIPPI: Okay. Thank you.

MR. KLIMSTRA: Yeah. And it was 13 in favor, two opposed.

And then just so we know, the one for 26A and B, which maybe that's what Jerry was thinking about, there was a whole separate one for that. That one just completely failed at the Western Arctic Herd Working Group, which is also -- yeah. Anyways so hopefully that adds a little bit of clarification. Sounds like we've got it there.

CHAIRMAN BROWER: All right.

MR. DEWITT: Mr. Chair. I have.....

MR. PERSON: Yeah, Mr. Chair. This is Brian Person, if I might just add real briefly.

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Go ahead, Brian. I'm going to recognize you. Bob has graciously declined

until you're done.

MR. PERSON: Okay. I apologize. Yeah, I didn't want to interrupt him, but I just want to point out that the two that voted nay were the only two North Slope residents, and that was Esther and I don't recall who was the representative from -- I believe it was from Wainwright at the meeting, but I could be wrong. But just to provide a little more detail.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BROWER: We see some affirmatives over here of the naysayers, which I like the naysayers. All right.

Bob, I'm going to go ahead and recognize you, representative from Wainwright, but also residing in Barrow nowadays.

MR. SHEARS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you, Brian.

 And allow me some clarification. On Wildlife Proposal 46, I voted against it at our last meeting, and let me describe my position. Redescribe my position of why.

Without a closure in Unit 26A that mirrors the closure in Unit 23, I believe that a closure in Unit 23 will divert non-Federally-qualified users to Unit 26A. The increased pressure in 26A is what influences whether Anaktuvuk Pass receives the gift of that herd or not. And so I believe that a closure in Unit 23 will put increased pressure on 26, which will result in Anaktuvuk Pass being negatively influenced. They will not get the caribou that typically come in there from the Western Arctic Caribou herd.

I have observed tracking data that during the -- when hunting was open for sport hunting that seem to indicate that the Western Arctic Caribou Herd was being prematurely diverted in 26A to the west of the community when sport hunting was happening there. And so I thought -- I believe that a closure in Unit 23 will result in increased pressure in 26A.

Since the proposal to close 26A failed

last year, I couldn't support a closure in 23. However, I was one of the few minorities that it went ahead and passed. Now that we have additional data that suggests the population of the herd has improved dramatically, having -- you know, submitting a new proposal for closure in 26A will absolutely fail, because like Neil says, the population of the herd can support harvest by non-qualified-Federal users.

In that regard, now that the Western Arctic Caribou Herd Working Group is asking us to reconsider a proposal to relax restrictions in 23A, I support that. Anything that we can do to relax, this contradicts OSM's recommendation I acknowledge. And the 23A InterAgency Working Group.

 I would -- I'm not going to sponsor or make a motion for a proposal to reconsider this, you know, reducing it from full closure to only two years or to an area recommended, just like the area recommended by the Working Group. I don't think it's my position to make that proposal, but anybody here on this Council who is willing to sponsor a proposal or a motion that will restrict -- I mean, reduce the restrictions on harvest in 23, right now I think I would support it, because it would have a secondary effect.

 It would lighten the pressure on Anaktuvuk Pass.

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Always bends my mind sometimes when I want to understand you, but any other discussion. And thank you for providing the additional information on what the voting pressure, and it seems to me like they were pretty much aligned in the vote to modify the closure for Unit 23 to include the site map that kind of depicts an area of influence for Noatak.

And I kind of agree with Bob that there is an action that's still pending I think for us to close Unit 26A, and I think if we came up with a very cool, logical approach to look at what Noatak is proposing that kind of looks like a village area of influence, and looking at -- you know, here's the deal on some of these issues. Even though there's a large population of caribou, I mean, I think it's still -- we should look at this as conservative management. Even

if there was a liberal management, you can deplete that resource, the availability of those resources for a community by deflecting them, by moving them out of the reach of reasonable substance user access by impeding their movement by deflection.

That is -- if you were to analyze that, and I've made these analytical stuff around Nuiqsut to advocate for mitigation funds for direct deflection of migratory movements of animals where they're normally found and reasonable -- for the reasonable opportunity to harvest them. That's been done. There's precedence there that you can in fact deplete the resource to where Tier hunts in State lands, and look at areas to limit them to Federally-qualified users to making sure those resources are available for food security issues for communities. Even in a liberal management scheme you can do these things. And also minimize and eliminate user conflicts by doing this stuff. The Borough can do it by rezoning if it wants to. But I think it would be better to work with managers.

We can't control the harvest take, you know. We can't dictate anybody taking the harvest, but we can certainly protect subsistence user access. Subsistence user access. They're key issues, and I think it's important, so I disagree with Bob, but I agree with Bob. You know, there's maybe a term of art that you're going to have to learn how to recognize Bob's thinking here. But, anyway, that's what I think.

Any other talk about these kind of things, because -- and I want to ask Eva, our coordinator. We still have an action pending on the Unit 26 where the special action was rejected by the dead caribou that publicized it, you know, that came to testify. I could have gone over there and gotten my knife and started cutting it and eating it right there by the way. It was still good. But we still had a regular in the queue an action that is going to probably fail miserably in front of the Federal Subsistence Board maybe if I don't go there myself and advocate for it and talk them to death until they approve it. Anyway, maybe you could enlighten us on that part.

MS. PATTON: Mr. Chair and Council. That's correct. So that the Council did submit a special action request, which is a request to the

2

3 4

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14 15 Page 204

Federal Subsistence Board out of cycle, out of the regular two-year cycle for wildlife proposals. that request was declined by the Federal Subsistence Board. The Council at the same meeting had also submitted a request -- so a special action request asks for enactment of a change in regulations prior to the two-year cycle of regulations. So that was declined by the Board. But the full proposal is in process still. So the Council reviewed and took action on their own proposal, as did the Western Interior Regional Advisory Council, because that Unit 26B is within their hunt area. Those recommendations go to the Board at their April -- the week of April 13th meeting. And the process is for the Chair of each Council to attend the Board meeting and provide the Council's recommendation to the Board.

16 17 18

19

20

So this proposal, all the Federal proposals are still pending and will come before the Board in April. And so no action has taken place on Unit 26A and B request for closure either.

212223

2425

26

27

28

29 30

31

32

33 34

35

36

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Thank you, Eva. I think it's good to refresh our memory, because we do have new members here as well, what we did last fall I believe with the special action that went to the Federal Subsistence Board. And I was made to understand by one of the Federal Subsistence Board members that it was a nearly 50/50 split, maybe one vote could have swayed that at that time. And that's a God's honest truth, you know, one more guy. If I was there slapping them around, I think I could have swayed that, you know. But in light of the new information that's coming around, and which we need to be very diligent that this is a blip at this point. I don't think we should be dealing with blips in this way to sway the opinions.

41

42

43

44

And, you know, I'm still concerned, because there is an action that we've made for Unit 26A and B I believe because based on the population issues, that we had recommended, right, when we're -- we don't make the decision, but we recommend, in our proposal to the Federal Subsistence Board, and they haven't taken that up yet. And they're doing that in April?

45 46 47

MS. PATTON: That's correct. The Federal Subsistence Board will meet the week of April, and they take up all the Federal subsistence wildlife

49 50

proposals, and they make the final decision to adopt or oppose,....

2 3 4

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Right.

5 6

MS. PATTON:adopt or reject the

7 8 9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19 20

21 22

23

2425

proposals.

CHAIRMAN BROWER: And the one thing I'm going to be very, very alarmed, and very, very scared about is OSM. OSM is sometimes -- well, maybe 80 percent of the time maybe. OSM will say things and analyze this in a way to sway the opinion against the Regional Council's direction. And it's always alarmed me when I see in a recommendation OSM does not support this in fact, you know, and say those kinds of things when we're trying to do some things that would benefit the community's ability to maintain adequate harvesting, and the issues since we've done a lot to curtail the harvest from these herds to help. We enacted our own traditional laws that we abide by, and put them into law what we normally did anyway. We don't hunt the bulls when it's rutting season, so we cut that out and made it into law, right. We did that. And we make it illegal to hunt the calf accompanied by....

26 27 28

MS. AHTUANGARUAK: Cows accompanied by

29 30 31

32

33 34

35

36

37 38

39 40

41

calf.

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Yeah, a cow accompanied by a calf. You shoot one of those, you should go to jail. I mean, it's the -- you know, we didn't hunt the -- unless, you know, it was yearling. And in the past people would hunt yearlings and stuff like that for clothing, because, (in Inupiat), they've got good fur for making clothing. So I don't want to reargue and retalk all about that stuff, but that's already happened, because we worked with our own group knowing that ADF&G was going to start visiting all of the communities and say, we're going to just cut across the board here and recommend some laws.

And the Borough and these Regional Councils were very proactive to reduce the bag limits from 10 and 15 down to 5 I think, and to live with that as a prudent measure of conservativeness.

47 48 49

46

Anyway I'm going way too long I think

2

3 4

5

6 7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

Page 206

because when we want to try to do something, sometimes we over-justify, and we need to over-justify, because we don't really know what you're going to, you know, put on your big boy pants and go talk to the Federal Subsistence Board to sway those opinions. And, you know, if there was something that OSM was going to do to intervene, I would say, create this map of Noatak all across the North Slope. Create it for the North Slope in lieu of closing Unit 26A and Unit 26B. these maps like this for Anaktuvuk, for Point Hope, for Point Lay, for Barrow, for Atgasuk. You do that, you're going to go a long ways to providing the food security issues that have plagued the community, user conflict issues. You do that, and I think it's going to go a long ways to seeing eye-to-eye in the concerns that we raise. Because when -- Unit 26A and Unit 26B is a vast, vast area, and a sweeping change to limit that to Federally-qualified users, and then just roll the dice -- because I think we all roll the dice here. We tend to roll the dice. It's all or nothing almost.

20212223

24 25

26

And I think this is a fantastic compromise in doing this. If it was supported 13 to 2 to make that modification by, what was the acronym, WACH? From the WACH group, and that's a big group if you look at the newsletter. They made a comprehensive approach to seeing eye-to-eye and compromise.

27 28 29

30

31

32

Anyway that's how I would talk to the Federal Subsistence Board. If our proposal goes there, that's what I wold go down there and advocate for. And if OSM is going to say no because there's a blip, it's alarming.

33 34 35

36

Anyway I'm going way too long. Give the opportunity to Council members to talk about the potential modification to WP18-46.

41

42

43

44

45

46 47

48

MS. AHTUANGARUAK: Mr. Chair. For me, this is very concerning. We put it in to protect concerns coming from Point Lay and Point Hope are related to the units that they're in. And some of the justification is in opposition to protecting those communities in lieu of trying to protect another community in Anaktuvuk Pass. Those are very concerning issues to support one versus the other. I don't want our region to divide ourselves because of efforts to protect one unit versus another unit, to give benefits to our communities. These are very divisive

discussions that are being put forward. We have different units in village concentrations that are affecting some of these discussions. What we have in the area of Unit 23 versus what we have in the Village of Anaktuvuk Pass are different discussions. And so it shouldn't be put in one versus the other and sacrificing one village for another to hope in protecting.

8 9 10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

2

3 4

5

6 7

We also put forward our own traditional, cultural preferences in our harvesting. I've had hunters come to me and said they're not harvesting female caribou, and they prefer to hunt those, but they have foregone some of these traditional harvest to give hopes in renewal to the concentration of the numbers that we're having available for harvest. These kind of factors are very important when you're looking at the assessments of whether or not we're being successful in this discussion.

19 20 21

2.2

23

24 25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33 34

35

36

37 38

When you isolate some of these discussions for one unit versus another unit in various protective mechanisms, there are those reflections that happen with hunters going -- for flying into Unit 23 that change into Unit 20A or 26 -- I mean, 26A or 26B. And yet there are assumptions that are being included in this discussion as to support why decisions are being made, but yet there's got to be some statistical data that shows where those permit changes are occurring in some of this discussion. So without having those supporting numbers, we're making assumptions without the supporting numbers that could be incorporated into this discussion to show, yes, there are deflections from these concentrated efforts of having to try to protect 23 that are now causing increased conflict for Anaktuvuk Pass. And so not having that discussion included here really impacts our assessment of the interpretation of what are we responding to.

39 40 41

42

43

44

45

46 47

48

For me, being most protective of our villages and their access to our resources is why we chose the actions that we chose. We didn't come across them because 23 put in their restrictions in. We came across them, because we had multiple herds with populations decline. And we looked at the overall reports of multiple herds to come up with our decision to support efforts to restrict hunting that was occurring by outside non-Federal users in Unit 23. We

recognized it was going to change with some of the access that is coming in 26A and B, but without getting some of that statistical data, that's very important in this discussion. So I hope that at some point we're going to get some of that information, because it's not being provided. It's being supported in comments of our participants on why they're making decisions.

So those are two of the hesitations that I have. I don't want us to divide and put in opposition for Point Hope with Anaktuvuk and Nuiqsut in some of these discussions. We can't go down to that level of division that this discussion is facilitating. This discussion is facilitating this conflict between our region, and that's very concerning that some of these decisions are being supported without the data because of that.

I recognize that you guys got involved in some of the discussions that we didn't have fully presented at our meeting here, because of the way that the information was presented with the Western Arctic Caribou Herd Working Group, and that also may have contributed to some of your discussions there. But I'm on the side of being very precautious.

And we went through the presentation this morning that showed there's possibilities for some number of improvements to these research projects that show caribou numbers. But we also showed that we have reasons to wait to see is this specificity related to improvements in data collection that allows numbers to be counted that weren't previously counted, or are these real, true improvements to the population. There's questions that are unanswered in that discussion that I say that we should continue to watch what we've already put forward and continue the restrictions that were being supported with this extensive participation to try to protect this herd and these communities.

But I also know that we put in effort to renew the restrictions for Anaktuvuk Pass with their controlled use areas, but we don't have the discussion as to how that is supporting the concerns for their community and whether or not those protections are being protected, or are we just waiting for more statistical data to show that, I'm sorry, we threw over 400 fly-in hunters or whatever that number is going to

be that now conflict with the discussion for Anaktuvuk Pass. That's very, very concerning on how this discussion is going.

3 4 5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18 19

2

We want to be proactive in this discussion. We know by making the decisions that we made, we took food off of families' tables. Many villages had food taken off their table. It's not a light decision that we put forward. It's because of the accumulation of this and the reality that our traditional knowledge knows that if we don't put the protective mechanisms in, the hardship is going to continue for our families. And without having all of the supporting data to show that we should go ahead and jump up, we have others that have come up with different numbers and saying, we should open to other users and hunters to continue to harvest, and we have a surplus data. But we're blurring some of this communication without the supporting data to show, yes, we should do that.

20 21 22

23

24 25

26

27

28

So I would rather maintain the reality that we put these protective mechanisms in. If we get the reports next year that show that the data is continuing to improve, then I'd be much more willing to accept some changes to these discussions. But we don't have that to fully accept. We have recommendations that are showing that there could be some consideration. It doesn't mean we have to act upon it.

29 30 31

32

33 34

35

36

37

38

Others want to continue to come up and harvest, and they will impact our ability for our villages to harvest. We ought to do what we can and allow some of these protective mechanisms to show whether or not they're protective before we jump in and allow the increased risks to come back to our villages who are already going without the food that we need to give us the life, health and safety that we need to feed our families.

39 40 41

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Thank you, Rosemary.

42 43

Any other deliberations and talk about

44 WP18-46. 45

(No comments)

46 47 48

CHAIRMAN BROWER: I just want to -- you know, I like to remain cautious, and I like to be well

informed, and at the same time knowing that this will go before the Federal Subsistence Board, and they're 2 going to -- we're ultimately recommending for a 3 4 neighbor of ours. We're ultimately just recommending for a neighbor and, you know, our cousins down here in 5 Unit 23. And whether it shifts hunting pressure in our 6 7 area remains to be seen. More than likely, yeah, it probably would. But when you look at why the original 8 WP 46 was to close all of Unit 23, and was a 9 recommendation from the Western Arctic Working Group. 10 11 And that was based on the user conflicts that I could remember. And the user conflicts that are, you know, 12 quite alarming I thought, to where you couldn't -- you 13 didn't pass on a traditional hunting experience any 14 15 more, but you heard your parents cursing, you heard, man, I'm going to shoot that plane down. Those kind of 16 things. That facilitated anger and that did not pass 17 18 down a traditional hunting experience that I grew up with with many of my siblings and others. But the area 19 is -- that was identified here was passing on 20 arguments. And the traditional hunting experience had 21 2.2 been given away to first come, first served, and those 23 kind of things. So we need to be mindful of that.

At the same time, you know, I see Rosemary's logic here as well. Maybe we don't touch our recommendation at all, and let the Federal Subsistence Board see what our recommendation. Hey, the North Slope guys say, yeah, we agree with Western Arctic Working Group's original look see at this, and close it and try to make sure that the hunting and traditional activities be looked into, and maybe there is an area to designate for sport and other users that would not compete with traditional needs of communities. The traditional hunting patters, and not ass on arguments, but to pass on love and caring and these things that make up communities. Because the area is vast. There should be other areas to use, to concentrate the non-Federally-qualified users and, you know, personal use, and look at the sanctity of communities use.

41 42

2425

26

27

28

29 30

31

32

33 34

35

36

37

38

39

40

Thank you.

43 44 45

MR. DEWITT: Mr. Chair.

46 47

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Go ahead, Josh.

48 49

MR. DEWITT: This is Neil DeWitt again.

One of the things -- I have an appointment, I need to go, so I'm going to be hanging up.

 But one other thing I wanted to bring up is while you are considering all this reopening or closing or whatever, keep in mind you've got the Ambler Road that's going to go in. And I went to a meeting where they said there was going to be 30 trucks a day that comes out once that road gets put in. So that means there's at least 30 that are going back in. So that will be 60 trucks a day. Plus you've got all the fuel, all the food, and anything else that they might need out there to build that mine that's going to be running back and forth. And that's going to cut right through the middle of the Arctic herd. So keep that in mind.

Also, I don't know how many of your folks out there know it, but it's something that you need to start looking at and really getting involved in. They did have an open comment period, but I don't remember what the dates on that were. But I foresee it happening, and it's going to cut right through the middle of that herd, and that's where you're really going to start having problems. It's not going to be with the five percent that the rest of the people in the United States and in the State of Alaska take of the herd.

But thank you for your time, sir, and you all have a good day.

Bye-bye.

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Thank you, Neil.

I'm going to recognize Josh before we maybe recess for lunch here.

 MR. REAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I just quickly wanted to mention, and many of the Council members have already touched on this, but the Federal Subsistence Board can close based on either conservation concern or the concerns related to the continuation of subsistence uses and user conflicts. And the justification for the past couple of closures over the past couple of years has been that continuation of subsistence and the use conflicts. And the maps that were used to develop the targeted closure

```
2
```

```
Page 212
     were based on where we know intense user conflicts have
     happened over time through public testimony at the
 2
     Regional Advisory Council meetings, at the Board
 3
 4
     meetings, and other places.
 5
                     The InterAgency group, which is both
 6
 7
     State and Federal land managers, met after being
     directed to do so by the Federal Subsistence Board to
 8
     try to see if that was an appropriate area, or if it
 9
10
     should be reduced or expanded. And their
11
     recommendation was, the OSM recommendation on this,
     that it should be expanded slightly to include a larger
12
     area, particularly in the northwestern portion of the
13
     original targeted closure. So that's where the
14
15
     targeted closure boundaries came from.
16
                     Thank you.
17
18
19
                     CHAIRMAN BROWER:
                                       I'd like to entertain
20
     a motion to recess for lunch.
21
2.2
                     MS. AHTUANGARUAK: So moved.
23
24
25
                     UNIDENTIFIED VOICE:
                                          So moved.
26
                     CHAIRMAN BROWER: All right. Motion
27
     for lunch. Seconded. All those in favor of recess say
28
29
     aye.
30
31
                     IN UNISON:
                                 Aye.
32
33
                     CHAIRMAN BROWER:
                                       Okay. We'll be back
     at 1:15.
34
35
                     (Off record)
36
37
                     (On record)
38
39
40
                     UNIDENTIFIED:
                                    So move.
41
                     CHAIRMAN BROWER: All right.
                                                    There's a
42
     motion on the floor to get out of recess.
43
44
                     MS. HUGO:
                                Second.
45
46
                     CHAIRMAN BROWER:
                                       It has been seconded.
47
     All those I favor of getting back to the meeting and
48
     get out of recess say aye.
49
50
```

```
Page 213
                     IN UNISON:
 1
                                 Aye.
 2
 3
                     REPORTER: Who seconded?
 4
 5
                     MS. HUGO:
                                I did.
                                        I'm sorry.
                                                    My....
 6
 7
                     CHAIRMAN BROWER:
                                       Yeah.
                                              Esther.
 8
 9
                     REPORTER:
                                Thank you, Esther.
10
                     CHAIRMAN BROWER: All right.
11
     back in business.
12
13
                     And the last we left we were discussing
14
15
     with Josh, and we discussed the WACH and their vote to
     amend their Unit 23 proposal by incorporating a map and
16
     reducing the size of the area to be closed signified by
17
     map 1 I believe. There's map 1 and map 2.
18
                                                Map 2 is
     OSM's conclusions, and map 1 is the WACH Working Group,
19
     and what was supported by them by a vote of 13 to 2 I
20
     believe. If that's not the case, let me know. But I
21
2.2
     believe map 1 is the one that we're talking about.
23
                     There is a difference between map 1 and
24
     map 2. Map 2 from OSM explores a greater area to close
25
     on the north side; whereas on map 1 from the WACH
26
     Working Group show that to be limited to it looks like
27
     about -- I don't know if that's a mile on the river on
28
     either side. Is it five miles? Five miles on either
29
30
     side of the river, and a larger portion of lands
     controlled by BLM to the south; whereas map 2 has
31
     expanded to the north, not just along the river, but by
32
     many different little tributaries to the river, and
33
34
     minimize the area to the south controlled by BLM.
35
     administered lands. So that's the difference I see in
     that.
36
37
38
                     So map 1 is the proposed that they
     voted on to change their proposal on Unit 23 closure
39
     for 18 -- what was the number here -- 18-46.
40
     encompasses map 1. Which before the ones that we voted
41
     on last fall was the entire Unit 23 closure at the
42
     request of the WACH. So since then they've modified
43
     their area to map 1.
44
45
                     And whether or not we take up some
46
47
     modifications to our recommendation, and our
     recommendation back in the fall was to help support the
48
     WACH and the Western Arctic Caribou Herd Working Group,
49
```

which at the time proposed the entire Unit 23. Since then they've made modification to their special action.

With that, is there any other discussion we want to have, or is there anything you would like to add, Josh, if I've misspoken in any way?

MR. REAM: I would just point out that the Western Arctic Caribou Herd Working Group's recommendation was for that targeted closure, and it is just the two-year time limit. So it's not indefinite.

The only other thing is that map 2 that was developed by the InterAgency group was developed before the new biological information came out, and before the Western Arctic Caribou Herd Working Group made their decisions.

Thank you.

 CHAIRMAN BROWER: I do have a question for OSM and making OSM conclusions. Obviously it appears that OSM is advocating for something different, and there's always underpinnings why that is. And there's got to be a reason that you would sway the map movement. Is it for greater inclusion or what was the justification for expanding it to the north and minimizing it in the south. According to me and some of the things that I've heard of the major concerns of conflict is right around those villages right there to the south. And to minimize it considerably from what was recommended by the WACH -- and it should be noted as to why OSM is recommending to make it into a tiny sliver from what the Western Working Group recommended, but expanding way to the north.

Go ahead, Josh.

MR. REAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair. So again this was the closure that was in place last year, map 1. And this is the areas where we had identified the majority of the user conflict over time.

To get to the area identified in map 2, the Federal Subsistence Board at their meeting last year had asked for a group to convene of both Federal and State land managers. This is what we're calling the InterAgency Working Group. They recommended that we expand farther north along the Noatak there based on

some of the land managers' concerns about known conflicts in those areas. They didn't provide us with a lot of justification for that decision.

3 4 5

2

There were no meeting minutes from their meeting, but that was their recommendation.

6 7 8

9

10

11

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Thank you. Well, that's the recommendation without real -- other than there were additional conflicts to the north there. Yeah. And you said this was a closure that was already in place for map 1 from the previous year?

12 13 14

15

16

MR. REAM: Yes, sir. The original closure two years ago was all Federal public lands in Unit 23, and last year's closure was this targeted closure that you see in map 1.

17 18 19

20

21 22

23

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Okay. Maybe I wasn't paying too much attention over there. I don't live there. Yeah, I do recall that when there was a joint meeting of Northwest Arctic Regional Advisory Council and the North Slope Regional Advisory Council, was that in 2015 in Anchorage?

242526

27

MS. PATTON: Mr. Chair and Council. That's correct. That was the winter/spring, March of 2016 actually.

28 29 30

31

32

33 34

35

36

37 38

39

40 41

42

43

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Yeah. It seems to me dates are getting convoluted here. I just want to keep my sanity. I keep thinking that we supported the Northwest Arctic Regional Advisory Council in closure of entire Unit 23 for that one year. Right? And it was passed by the Federal Substance Board. They supported us. And I was pretty flabbergasted. And that was during the period of time there was a lot of concern to going either preservation or extreme conservation measures, where bag limits and all that were all thrown up in the air and tossed around in that fashion. So I didn't know after that there was a more targeted closure that maybe didn't seek our recommendation or something, unless I wasn't here to be part of that.

44 45 46

47

48

MR. REAM: Mr. Chair. I'll just mention that the targeted closure was done by special action. And so we did hold public meetings in various communities, but it didn't -- it wasn't necessarily

presented as part of the regulatory cycle.

1 2 3

4

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Very good. Okay. You know, I'm just one of those that feeds off of information. I like to hear various opinions.

5 6 7

8

9

And is there a recommendation or a similar proposal that the Regional Advisory Council in that area, the Northwest Arctic Regional Advisory Council on Unit 23 closure, and what was their recommendation?

11 12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

232425

26

27

28

29 30

31

32

33 34

35

36

37

MR. REAM: I actually have in front of me, if you're interested, all of the affected Councils' recommendations. Now you're the first to hear about the Western Arctic Caribou Herd Working Group's decision. So we don't know yet whether or not the other Councils, the Northwest Arctic, the Seward Peninsula, and Western Interior, will make any changes. But at their fall meeting the Northwest Arctic Council did support a closure of all Federal public lands in Unit 23 as did your Council. And this is for the indefinite period. The Western Interior supported the OSM recommendation, so that expanded targeted closure, and that would be indefinite. And then I also have the Subsistence Resource Commissions. The Cape Krusenstern also supported the OSM recommendation, the expanded target of closure. And the Kobuk Valley Subsistence Resource Commission actually supported a targeted closure that was the original, so the smaller amount of land that is now being supported by the Western Arctic Caribou Herd Working Group, but theirs is also indefinite. And now the Working Group is two years. So there's the spacial component in all of these, you know, the full closure, the targeted closure, the expanded targeted closure, and then the two year and indefinite. So both space and time all of these groups have been voting on.

38 39 40

41

42

43

44

CHAIRMAN BROWER: And again I'm a little starved for -- a little confusion on my part maybe, and to clear it up here. The indefinite term, obviously we voted for that, and that was the Unit 23 closure. And is indefinite period coming up for vote by the Federal Subsistence Board in April?

45 46 47

MR. REAM: Mr. Chair. That was the original proposal, so it will come in front of the Federal Subsistence Board, and by indefinite -- I mean,

49 50

it could be changed if a proposal was submitted during the next wildlife cycle to change it, or if it was changed by special action in the interim. It just means that it will be on the books until there's a proposal to make a change.

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Yeah, that's what I wanted to understand. Let's say that this modification for two years is kind of like a trump card for that, isn't it. If that Federal Subsistence Board is going to take up Unit 23 closure, this one would supersede the indefinite period to limit it to two years, but for the cutting it down to an area of influence that's being talked about.

MR. REAM: That is correct. And likewise if it was only a two-year closure, your Council or someone else could propose, if conditions changed or remained the same, to extend that or eliminate that in two years. Uh-huh.

 CHAIRMAN BROWER: Very good. I just want to make sure all of the Council understand, you know, until another proposal comes in to trumps that, or supersedes that, or an action, or something like that. Does a special action plan supersede an indefinite period?

MR. REAM: A special action wold be implemented for one regulatory year. So after the regulatory year, the wildlife regulations would go back into effect unless there was another special action or the -- if we were in a wildlife cycle, there was a proposal to change that regulation. So the special action is for one regulatory year.

 CHAIRMAN BROWER: Okay. So if Unit 23 was closed, and the Federal Subsistence Board closed it at the recommendation, a subsequent -- a special action that had a little area to open it this way for a period of one year, after that elapsed, it would go back to being closed.

MR. REAM: Mr. Chair. That is correct. A special action could be used to open the area or to close the area.

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Very good. You know, I always like to learn a little bit more and understand

clearly what we're juggling here.

So at this point, the WACH has recommended a change, but the two Regional Councils -- or the Regional Councils that's taken up the torch at the request of the WACH, because this was an original -- was this an original request for closure of Unit 23 by the Western Arctic Working Group committee?

 $$\operatorname{MR}.$ REAM: Yes. That was 18-46, and 47 was by Enoch Mitchell of Noatak, and that was with the two-year stipulation.

CHAIRMAN BROWER: The original. Okay. Now I'm a little bit more concerned, because you talk about an indefinite one. Now, who recommended the indefinite one?

MR. REAM: Mr. Chair. That was originally the proponent, the Western Arctic Caribou Herd Working Group. And since they've gotten the new information and met here in December, they've changed their recommendation on their own proposal to the targeted closure for two years only.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Very good. All right. I think I kind of understand and asked all the questions I needed and refreshed all my memory back to where I was about last fall. And in doing that, and I'm hoping that Jerry and the new members are now very informed about what was going on back then, what is being requested now, and what OSM is recommending in map 2. And I believe that map 1 is still being advocated by the WACH, right? And OSM is -- had a little bit of consternation over map 1 I presume to try to introduce their own map 2.

MR. REAM: Mr. Chair. I don't believe that OSM has reconsidered the Western Arctic Caribou Working Group's proposed change. In that I really mean that the InterAgency group, the State and Federal land manager group, has not reconvened to consider a different boundary.

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Very good. All right. Well, I'm going to relieve you from any further questioning unless the Council has additional questions $\frac{1}{2}$

for Josh. Jerry.

MR. SHEARS: Yes, thanks for the clarification on that, Mr. Chair.

Yes, I was kind of puzzled on the Unit 23 on the Federal 18-46 closure for two years. And thanks for the clarification.

CHAIRMAN BROWER: (In Inupiaq) We're going to think about these things. It's always good to greatly understand.

So with that, any further questions for

 Josh.

(No comments)

19 CHAIRMAN BROWER: If not, what's the 20 wish of the Council. Do we want to leave our

wish of the Council. Do we want to leave our recommendation as is, or do we want to recommend modification of our recommendation to include map 1 to the extent of the closure in Unit 23, or go with OSM and recommend map 2. So I think we don't have to do anything, or we can support -- and I don't know about the Working Group themselves, if their determination was based on the new numbers. Is that the case?

MR. REAM: Mr. Chair. There may be somebody else in the room that's better equipped to talk to that point. I think that the new information is what is driving their new recommendation.

 CHAIRMAN BROWER: It looks like we've got Ryan coming up. And we do have concern about the new number as well, and not to jump into conclusions just yet. But maybe Ryan can enlighten us on that decision why to change it to a targeted closure versus the Unit 23 as a whole.

MR. KLIMSTRA: Yeah. Thank you, Gordon. I think Josh got that correct there. That is why they kind of changed their method there was based on the new number. And, you know, to have a little background on that, the targeted part, those are discussion that was had like in the room that folks agreed on, you know, that would benefit people in that region.

As far as the sunset clause, you know, where they got two years, there was two trains of thought there if I recall correctly. One was that just like we were talking about earlier, we don't want anything to happen right away with this. You know, this is a new thing. We need at least two years here to kind of like look at things.

7 8 9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

1

3 4

5

6

And, two, you've got to remember who was in that room, you know, that was coming to that conclusion. That was people that represent like professional sports hunters. That was all these other people that agreed that, hey, this -- two years, you know, we should probably do that. So I think it was just -- just remember that, too. Like the content that made up that vote, you know, there was some -- it was a really diverse group there that all agreed that, hey, two years of this targeted closure seems to make sense based on the information that we have now.

19 20 21

Thanks.

22 23

24 25

26

27

28

29 30

31

32

33 34

35

36

37 38

39

40 41

42

43

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Yeah, that's good to hear. And before I recognize you, Josh, I just want to say something. When you mention other use groups and working with them, and having my limited contact with Enoch, I think it was -- there's a couple Enochs. I don't know, there's Enoch Shiedt, and there's others from Buckland and other areas. I got to meet several people. It was kind of apparent that the feeling of hopelessness that they're always on an uphill battle in that whatever -- that's just the -- that's a perception I got was like they're lucky to get anything in return out of their group almost, I don't know exactly how to describe it, because of the 30 plus years of conflicts in their region, that it just goes on and on and on and on, and hearing that even from other user groups it's just for two years, it should be indefinite period to me. There should be a sense of community developed out of these kind of things to promote well being in communities to provide a healthy traditional experience to pass on to their groups. And we really need to embrace these things in that way, not look at it as a number.

44 45 46

47

48

Me and you are arguing about numbers a lot. I'm going to argue your ANS. I'm going to argue a lot of different things. Harvestable surplus. Because it leads to the willingness of the State

without the rural subsistence priority, the impasse that created a rift between the State and Federal managers, and that manage the lands for all of Alaska, and all the while you still have the tools in your back pocket to manage them in a way that would be beneficial. I've never seen the State use deflection in a term as when you deflect those resources away, you're depleting them even though their management scheme is liberal.

But the Borough has. The Borough has made determination that the resource has been depleted even though there were thousands and thousands and liberal management scheme, only because the depletion occurred by deflection. It was unreasonable to deflect these resources away from communities that expect them and depend on them for every day, to put food on the table. It's unreasonable to do. State needs to look at that and implement tier level maybe.

What does Tier I do?

MR. KLIMSTRA: You know, that's a good question. The tier system, I feel like we've got a bit of a misunderstanding on what the tier system does in terms of what it will do for the community. You know, somebody -- Phil, are you still on the line?

CHAIRMAN BROWER: I mean, I don't want to go into a big elaboration. What does Tier I do, Tier II.

MR. KLIMSTRA: Well, he's got a really good description, because he's gone through the process of what it would do exactly and what those different levels are. And I just want to make sure we get it right for you guys.

So, Phil, if you're there, could you elaborate on that?

MR. PERRY: Yeah. Hi. My name is Phillip Perry. I'm the regional management coordinator for Fish and Gam. And I think I can help out a little bit.

When we talk about Tier I as opposed to Tier II, one of the things that happens at that stage, if we're in that -- having a harvestable surplus in

Page 222

that range, is that non-residents of the State would be excluded from hunting. And most of the time that also then would mean that you would be using a registration permit. Not always. It doesn't require that, but most of the time you would be using a registration permit, not always, it doesn't require that, but most of the time you'd be using a registration permit and registration permits allow us to manage harvest if we need to, or if we need to limit harvest. But like right now with the RC907, the other thing that a registration permit allows us to is get a good gauge of what the harvest is and it also gives us, you know, specific people that are hunting, in this case, caribou, in an area.

So, you know, there's a couple of components to harvest reporting. Part of it is knowing how many animals have been harvested. But another part of it is documenting who's harvesting those animals. Where they live, you know, different communities, and the effort they put into it and those sorts of things.

So really when, you know, there are times we have harvest -- we have registration permits that were not in this Tier II sit -- or Tier I situation, I'm sorry, that -- yeah, that's at least the short answer. I can elaborate a little more if you want to talk about Tier II. I'm not sure we....

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Yeah, what then....

MR. PERRY:are going down that rabbit trail.

CHAIRMAN BROWER: What's Tier II. I kind of understand Tier I already.

MR. PERRY: So Tier II, once you go below that lower threshold of ANS, how it's applied in most cases, and it's applied in wildlife species and in fisheries, people -- residents of the state, it's for residents only, would apply for permits to harvest that wildlife resource, be it moose or caribou. And the harvest -- or, you know, managers would set a quota of how many you want to harvest, so say if we wanted to harvest 5,000 caribou, totally across, you know, the way it's written, is Western Arctic Herd and Teshekpuk, we would give out, probably not 5,000 permits because you would -- obviously because of harvest patterns it

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

11

12

13

14 15

16 17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24 25

26

27

Page 223

would be probably a higher bag limit per person, but you'd give out an appropriate number of permits and those permits are given out based on a person's, a hunters hunt history. So if it's someone that's hunted that area for 30 years they get scored and it's different than like a drawing permit when you just -everybody gets a random chance. Tier II gets scored and it's based on how long a person has hunted in that area, how long a person or someone in their household has hunted in that area, so if, you know, you have an elder living with you that's harvested animals there for 60 years, that goes into the scoring and then it also then takes scoring as far as where you live and where you buy your food and where you buy your gas. So they take all that, you get a score assigned to a hunter and then the top scores get permits.

So, you know, one of the negatives that we hear a lot of people talk about is, you know, it's an extra piece of paperwork. You would apply for a Tier II permit in the month of November, you would know here -- actually it's coming up very soon, mid- -- mid-February if you got a permit and then that permit would, you know, take effect the next regulatory year and that probably, in your case, would be in July. So it's moving from a -- you know as a registration

registration permits into a very paperwork intensive planning way ahead sort of system as far as for Tier II.

permit, a pretty easy to participate system with

30 11.

So that's a.....

32 33 34

CHAIRMAN BROWER: So is there other

35 tiers now after....

36 37

MR. PERRY:hopefully.....

38 39

CHAIRMAN BROWER:that?

40 41

MR. PERRY: No. Tier II is kind of the

42 most restrictive.....

43 44

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Uh-huh.

45 46

MR. PERRY:harvest regime that

47 occurs.

48 49

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Yeah. And, lastly, I

just wanted to -- what your thoughts are in the depletion of resources based on deflection for a community, and I don't know -- I don't think you've come across that and the Borough certainly has and it has policies in place for communities on the North Slope, and the resource, even though there are management processes that are outside of the scope of the Borough, the Borough can make a determination of resources that are subsistence resources that are depleted based on actions of others, development, guides, and effectively displaces those resources.

So have you come across something to deal with in that nature?

MR. PERRY: So I guess I'll just say that, you know, the question of caribou deflection, when it comes to -- lots of different things when it comes to development, when it comes to hunting parties and all that, is a very complicated and difficult question to answer. It's not something that I think right now anybody has a perfect answer to and there are other people that are much more qualified to answer that than me. But I certainly don't have the expertise or the experience to answer that very well.

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Okay. And that's fair. I think we just try to understand because some of the villages are in front of State lands and some villages are in front of Federal lands and we've always tried to work with the State to align regulations and seems to me the State would want to capitulate in working together when we have bent over backwards, I think in some cases, to align regulations so that they're more aligned, and to try to find ways of community's needs.

With that I'm going to -- is there any other questions that....

MS. ATKINSON: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Yeah, go ahead.

MS. ATKINSON: This is Hannah*.

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Yeah, go ahead,

48 Hannah.

135 Christensen Dr., Ste. 2., Anch. AK 99501

MS. ATKINSON: I wanted to add to the discussion about what the justification for the Western 2 Arctic Caribou Herd working group, I think that the new 3 census data was a part of why they made this most 4 recent decision. But I think there's also been other 5 conversations in public meetings and justification for 6 7 that smaller area that was in place during 2017. know that in the Kobuk Valley SRC meeting one of the 8 justifications given is that, Enoch Mitchell from 9 Noatak, said that the closure that was in place during 10 11 2017 worked for Noatak and he felt that they had seen positive results in their community being able to get 12 caribou. And so from those comments at those meetings, 13 I think that that's also in play during this 14 conversation, is, what works as far as solving the 15 issues that caused this idea for -- or the proposal for 16 Federal closures to come up. 17

18 19

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Yeah, thank you, Hannah. I think that's important to note. Was that Hannah?

212223

20

MR. SHEARS: Yes.

24 25

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Yeah, okay.

26 27

MS. ATKINSON: Yeah.

28 29 30

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Very good. Very good. So I'm going to see if there's any additional questions to Ryan or Josh.

31 32 33

(No comments)

34 35

36

37

38

CHAIRMAN BROWER: All right. Having no additional questions for you, what's the wish of the Council. Do you want to take up -- revisit the recommendation, leave it as is, adopt Map 1 for it in lieu of that, or Map 2.

39 40 41

42

43

45

46 47

48

I'm still concerned about, even the Western Arctic Caribou Herd working group's decision to use the new data, being that it's so fresh without a trend, and I would really love to see a trend occur, even though this is very positive and good news, there's still the issues about conflicts, and user conflicts and -- and I would still think that the herd should be managed very conservatively today and really think closely for managers and thinking about a very

logical way of managing the lands that include the well being of communities and the availability of these resources for those communities in a way that doesn't provide user conflict or minimize it to the extent that it's negligible.

So what's -- I'm going to leave that to the Council. I think we are well informed now. We've talked this over from every angle that we possibly could and leave it at that.

What's the wish of the Council.

 MS. AHTUANGARUAK: Mr. Chair, this is Rosemary. And I think that we should take no action on this. We put in a very protective mechanism in trying to work with this. We have efforts to influence our decision and to put some hesitancy and changing the responders on the maps, but our effort was to protect Unit 23 as a whole, recognizing the two communities from our Council that are very concerned about it, as well as the other communities around this area that we put the recommendations in.

We have information that is going to be -- continued to be gathered that can influence our future decisions in this. We have to come back and revisit it at the next process with other proposals that are being considered. But we were trying to be as protective as we can. Because we knew that we were impacting our families and their ability to put this food on their tables.

 But we knew that if we didn't take the precautions, that the impacts to our villages and our families was going to be longer, and that was a key determiner as to why we made the decisions that we made, it was to try to bring back the longevity of our concerns.

We will have additional data that comes to us as we continue to look at these issues. We're going to have other proposals that come to us in future meetings that will look at changing some of these discussions but we do have support from both entities that looked at the reasoning to limit the harvest from outside, from -- to our Federally-qualified-subsistence users and we are impacting our families already with the recommendations that we put forward. But we do

Page 227

this in hopes that we're going to prevent the longevity of these concerns. We know we have changes that are being proposed by our state and our region and there's efforts to put a risk factor that's going to greatly impact this region when they move forward with some of these planning efforts with that road that could go through here. And until we see what's going on, if we can't come back and change the protections that we put in place with this effort by weakening it and that's -- I'm not willing to continue to impact our families without, you know, really taking the strong protective mechanisms that we put forward in this discussion.

So my recommendation is to do no

CHAIRMAN BROWER: (In Inupiaq),

Rosemary.

action.

You know, I think we started this with a big heavy heart to deal with and to provide food on the table and provide meaningful traditional activities from our communities all the while that we knew at the time that the caribou declines were upon us, where harvest bags were already compromised, we've already made traditional -- where we do traditionally into law already and work towards that end.

So I think -- I tend to agree with Rosemary, we just be steadfast, maintain a strong position like this and the folks that are going to have to deal with it because I think if we reduce our language to just target it and they're already thinking, ah, we're compromising now at this point, so that even if we're compromising at this point and they're trying to justify the blip as a trend into a larger more liberal management scheme, that they quite possibly do away with the targeted approach.

So I tend to agree with Rosemary that we deliberated on this and we had a lot of substance in our dialogue to support it and based on a mere blip, without a trend, scientists would say, no, don't do anything yet. We often have to take serious -- very serious and comprehensive assessment and tally of the resource. There's another word that's at the tip of my tongue and I'm not getting it, it's about counting animals -- to -- about our whales. And to even increase the quota of the whale based on a census and

```
Page 228
     the whale watching under the International Whaling
     Commission, I mean this is just an example of trying to
 2
     increase that quota even by five or something like
 3
 4
     that, to our communities, is a monumental effort.
     count couldn't be more persuasive and relied upon when
 5
     you have a scientific methodology and a trend to back
 6
              And if I were to go to IWC with a mere blip
 7
     that up.
     and they would probably have a lot of questions as to
 8
     the validity without additional confirmations.
 9
10
     just afraid that the Western Arctic Working Group is
     persuaded in a way that -- that doesn't yield to
11
     scientific methodology in looking at trends.
12
13
14
                     With that, any other Council members
15
     want to chime in.
16
                     I'm with Rosemary and I think we be
17
     very cautious and I'd like to have several consecutive
18
     censuses that really start to speak to us.
19
20
                     And at the same time we still need to
21
     address user conflicts and things like that.
2.2
23
                     So, yeah.
24
25
26
                     Steve, from Point Hope.
27
28
                     MR. OOMITTUK: Yeah. Was that in the
29
     form of a motion.
30
                     MS. AHTUANGARUAK:
31
                                        Yes
32
                     MR. OOMITTUK: I would second that
33
34
     motion.
35
                     CHAIRMAN BROWER:
                                       There's a motion on
36
37
     the floor by Rosemary to.....
38
                     MS. AHTUANGARUAK: Take no action.
39
40
41
                     CHAIRMAN BROWER: .....take no action
     to revisit the RAC's recommendation on, is it WP18.....
42
43
44
                     MS. AHTUANGARUAK: 46/47.
45
                     CHAIRMAN BROWER: .....46 for Unit 23.
46
47
     Seconded by Steve Oomittuk from Point Hope.
48
                     Discussion.
49
```

```
2
```

```
Page 229
                     (No comments)
 2
 3
                     MR. OOMITTUK: Question.
 4
 5
                     CHAIRMAN BROWER: Question has been
     called for. All those in favor of having no action and
 6
 7
     no modifying our recommendation for WP18-46 as the
     Council signify by saying aye.
 8
 9
10
                     IN UNISON: Aye.
11
12
                     CHAIRMAN BROWER: All those opposed,
13
     same sign.
14
15
                     (No opposing votes)
16
                     CHAIRMAN BROWER: The ayes have it.
17
18
     The Council will not modify its recommendation at this
     time.
19
20
                     Thank you, Josh.
21
2.2
23
                                Thank you.
                     MR. REAM:
24
25
                     CHAIRMAN BROWER: And I'm going to
26
     yield to Madame Coordinator Eva to reorient us on our
     agenda.
27
28
                     MS. PATTON: Mr. Chair and Council.
29
30
     we are down to agency reports now. We have at the top
     of our list -- we did maintain a placeholder for tribal
31
     governments and Native organizations. I don't believe
32
     they were able to join us today. They had expressed
33
34
     some interest but noted that there were other meetings
35
     going on.
36
37
                     So just want to check on line if we
     have any tribal governments that have joined us this
38
     afternoon by teleconference.
39
40
41
                     (No comments)
42
43
                     MS. PATTON: Or any representatives
     from ICAS.
44
45
                     (No comments)
46
47
                     MS. PATTON: I don't believe so.
48
     they did note that there was lots going on this week so
49
50
```

they may not be able to participate.

 Next on the agency reports was Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. And just to let the Council know, too, that over lunch, we did get a reply, at the Council's request, we reached out to the Solicitor for the Federal Subsistence Management Program, he's not able to participate by teleconference but he did provide written reply that Robin was able to get on her email, if the Council would like that response from the Solicitor as well. At any time the Council wants to take that up we have that reply.

CHAIRMAN BROWER: I got to press my button, thanks Rosemary.

National Wildlife Refuge folks.

All right, Vince, have at it.

MR. MATHEWS: Yes, Vince Mathews representing Arctic National Wildlife Refuge as their subsistence coordinator. You're going to be getting a handout but I got a couple of updates above that as she's handing it out.

One is, we do have now a permanent new Arctic National Wildlife Refuge Manager, Steve Berendzen, my former boss. He was the Refuge manager for Yukon Flats, is now the -- well, the permanent Refuge Manager of Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. I'm pretty sure Lee has met him, I'm not sure if other members have.

 CHAIRMAN BROWER: What's his last name

again?

MR. MATHEWS: Berendzen.

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Okay.

MR. MATHEWS: He has a long history with Refuges. If I remember correctly it's about 30-plus years. He obviously worked at Yukon Flats Refuge but he was also regional supervisor for Refuges in Region 6, you know, down in the Colorado area. He was Refuge Manager at the arsenal down there in Denver. So he comes with a long history with Refuge. So, anyways, he's the new manager, possibly he'll be at future

21 22

 Page 231

meetings but there's a lot going on with that Refuge.

2/15/2018

I also want to share with you that, in general, the Refuges I serve, Kanuti, Yukon Flats and Arctic, we tend to have a more robust summary at the fall meeting than at the winter meeting so it's quite reduced, this one, but if there's additional information you want we can always add it or, you know, target to your requests at each meeting.

I didn't give you a full explanation of the Porcupine Caribou Harvest program or project that I'll be involved with. That will be a tribal wildlife grant, it's not for sure that it's -- you know, it's a grant, it has to be approved and it would be with the tribes of Kaktovik, Venetie, and that would be the combination of Arctic Village and Venetie Council, Fort Yukon, and I'll just be part of that writing team to write up that grant and then hopefully it will succeed in getting approved. That's to address the concern on needing more accurate data, your lengthy discussion this morning, for the harvest of that herd, looking at how they do it in Canada.

So that gives you an update more than what's on the page.

Real quickly, you can see there that the management of the Porcupine Caribou Herd is a cooperative effort. You can look at all the various governments that are involved as well as land claim agreements and local residents from communities in Alaska and Canada. It's managed by the International Porcupine Caribou Herd Board, and that is representatives of Canada, US, Yukon and Northwest Territories. And you can see down there the examples of the works that are being done. And Lee's probably more up to speed on these than I am but you can see the bulleted items of capture and radio-collaring caribou, purchasing the radio-collars, et cetera. You can see that there's a lot of, you know, monitoring of that particular herd.

You can also see in the next paragraph that it looks like the decline, you know, in the 1990s and early 2000s has changed, it's now increasing, with the most recent aerial photo census in July 2017 showing that it is now at a level of 218,000 caribou, which is the highest population ever recorded for this

herd. And you can go into the other data, I think I'll leave that up to you guys to look at. And, of course, Lee, is your key contact on that information.

3 4 5

2

And then I'll just hit some other quick

6 7 8

9

11

12

13

14 15 points.

And, Lee's already touched upon some of this, but, basically, in January of this year most of the herd was wintering in the southern Brooks Range between Arctic Village and the Dalton Highway. Caribou distribution, this winter, extends further westward than it has generally been in the case in the past, and you've mentioned that in your discussion about -- I think you said caribou jumping over the Brooks Range -- love to get a picture of that.

16 17 18

(Laughter)

19 20

21 22 MR. MATHEWS: But the point is, is they move around and that, so this is giving you an idea that this seems to be a little bit different than in the past.

23 24 25

26

27

28

29 30

31

32

33 34

35

36

37 38

39

40 41

So I'll move on to the moose. And I'm almost certain that Lee brought up, you know, that there's only two permits issued and that one moose was harvested this year. And I think he indicated they will be looking at going out for the second moose. can see that there's not a lot of moose in the area and most of the moose observed in the upper tributaries of the Kongakut River drainage, which is a long distance from the village of Kaktovik. So the Arctic Refuge Manager authorized two permits for subsistence harvest, a bull moose in the Kongakut River drainage, and I already mentioned that one was harvested. So it is a major effort and the Refuge is recognizing Kaktovik's needs as all the issues you discussed about caribou, whales, seals, et cetera. You guys have done an excellent job for me, personally, showing that we can't just look at one species in singular, we have to look at all species because it's a subsistence economy.

42 43 44

45

Anyway, so you can see that there and then I don't know, you can read on your own, survey of south side of the Brooks Range.

46 47 48

Okay.

49 50

135 Christensen Dr., Ste. 2., Anch. AK 99501

With muskoxen, they just don't seem to stay over here. So no survey was conducted, however, one bull muskoxen was seen on the coastal plain during the April moose survey and then, again, Lee kind of indicated that, that no visitors -- you know, visitors are out there, no visitors or Fish and Wildlife Service Staff reported observing muskoxen in the Refuge this summer.

8 9 10

2

3 4

5

6 7

Any questions about muskox. I know you guys discuss that on and off. But I'll wait.....

11 12 13

MR. KAYOTUK: Mr. Chair.

14 15

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Yeah, go ahead, Lee,

from Kaktovik.

16 17 18

19

20

21

MR. KAYOTUK: I know we got at least three or four muskox now are wintered in the HulaHula at this time along with probably like maybe 70 caribou. But they overwintered on the HulaHula, like 40 miles from Kaktovik.

22 23 24

Thank you.

25 26

27

28

29

30

MR. MATHEWS: Yeah, so there is a special hunt for that muskoxen. I'm the one that would be issuing those permits but there has to be a certain number in there and they just don't come over and so there is that available and, again, it's a very limited hunt when the population is up at that level.

31 32 33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40 41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

Sheep is a continuing interest for this -- well, for Kaktovik, but also for other areas of the North Slope and all along the Brooks Range. So you can see there that in 2016 Fish and Wildlife Service and National Park Service biologists collaborated on a trial of aerial transect surveys covering 4,000 square miles in the center of the Brooks Range. The survey area included the HulaHula watershed on the north side of the Brooks Range and the Arctic Village Sheep Management area on the south side. Population estimate for the area was -- well, I'll modify a little bit, 3,300 with a confidence interval of 95 percent, while a density of .83 sheep per square mile or -- yeah, we'll just leave it at square mile. The ratio of lambs to ewes was .30. I'm pointing this out because you had addressed with the Arctic Village Sheep Management Area closure, and that is before the Board, and may be

before you many more times. Hopefully not but it may be.

2 3 4

5

6 7

8

9

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

So, anyways, that was the 2016 data. You can see here the 2017 data. They used that same method but a smaller area and extending more to the eastern edge of the 2016 survey to Canada border. survey produced 2,000 total sheep, confidence interval again at 95 percent, and a density estimate of .55 sheep per square mile. They quickly point out -- this was put together by our lead biologist for the Refuge, one reason for the difference, because he wanted to point out why there is a difference between these density estimates was that the 2016 survey included the HulaHula where sheep density is generally higher than the average throughout the remainder of the Refuge. It's unlikely that the sheep population actually declined between 2016 and '17. And if you have questions on that I'm sure there's a couple of biologists behind me that can address those. But the whole point of it is, is they're pointing out that it was a different area and that but it's not indicating a decline. The ratio of lambs to ewes during the 2017 survey increased to .43.

242526

27

So they're planning to survey the remaining one-third of the sheep habitat of the Refuge during July 2018.

28 29 30

31

32

33 34

35

Although the results of the transect surveys are not directly comparable with the methods used in previous years, sheep abundance seems to be low compared to the numbers seen during 2000 to 2010, however the land abundance was relatively high during both 2016 and '17, suggesting that the population may be in the process of recovery.

36 37 38

39

40 41

42

So, with that, that concludes, you know, giving you kind of an update and, as, always, if there's anything else you would want to know from this Refuge or Fish and Wildlife Service, in general, I would be the point that would go out there and knock on people's doors to make sure it gets back to you.

43 44 45

So I'll leave that, if there's any

46 47 48

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Well, thank you,

49 Vince.

50

questions.

MR. SIKVAYUGAK: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Question's to Vince. Jerry from Anaktuvuk.

MR. SIKVAYUGAK: Yes. Apparently what surprised us that we're getting some muskox into our area just about every year. And as for Marcy, she was up there just recently last summer doing some sheep count and according to the documents here, the age, sex, and composition were not conducted during 2016 and '17, but they were up there last summer doing a sheep count.

MR. MATHEWS: Well, with muskox, my more background is in Interior Alaska, yeah, one showed up near Galena and our phones were ringing, what is this animal, what is, you know.....

(Laughter)

MR. MATHEWS:can we hunt it, can we do this, what about that and et cetera, so they do roam around, the muskox.

The point of this is, is that, there was a subsistence need or desire with muskox on the North Slope in 26C, established hunt was there to provide that need but the population hasn't been high enough to allow that to go, that's how it relates to you guys. I've heard all the discussions about interference between muskox and others, I'm not ignoring that but just pointing out what we have in the book.

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Thank you, Jerry.

Was that pretty good for a response.

MR. SIKVAYUGAK: (Nods affirmatively)

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Additional questions. Lee from Kaktovik.

MR. KAYOTUK: Mr. Chair. I noticed last summer -- and I mean I wish they could open it by the Canadian border because we see -- we thought it was a herd of 50 caribou but it was a herd of 51 muskox in that area. You know, just how -- you know it's been

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

Page 236

closed for many years in our area but, you know, if it was like the moose population, you know, some people wish it would come back and hunt in that location of muskox just for that area only for, you know, just for the caribou in our area is pretty scare, you know, we got to go miles and miles, so does a moose, you know, but, you know, if it's available down the road or sometime you know there's a few people that would be interested. And, you know, with the population that's opened in that area they should open it up for -- to harvest any/or muskox.

12 13

Thank you.

14 15

16

17 18

19

20

21 22

23

24 25

26

27

28

11

MR. MATHEWS: On that note, yes, from my view of this, which is mainly through the proposal process, that would have to be a proposal because the current season is based on a percentage of the population or something similar to that. And, boy, I'm really straining my memory now because that's been closed so long, that it has to be like over 300 muskox present. But the parameters before us now would not allow a limited hunt on there so you'd have to -- you know, the 50 or whatever, shows up, it would have to be a special action. The counter to that would be looking at the entire muskox population, I assume -- I mean they don't recognize Canada and United States, they just don't, you know, see that line, so it would be looking at the entire populations.

29 30 31

But the way to get that opportunity there, not saying it'll get passed, would be through a proposal.

33 34 35

36

37

38 39

32

MR. KAYOTUK: Mr. Chair. So how -that works like through -- now, we're getting into the
Yukon government after the Arctic National Wildlife
Refuge, now we're getting into the population of the
Yukon government, will that be seen as a border
population you think?

40 41 42

43

44

45

46

47

48

MR. MATHEWS: I have zero background on how this would interface with the Yukon. That's why I'm excited to be involved in this Porcupine Caribou Herd because they have pressures on their resources, I'm not going to say it's heaven over there or hell. What I'm trying to say is they have a different way of looking at things and, of course, they have First Nation status so I'm real excited to learn that and to

work with them. I did meet with their surveyors many years ago, we did a joint training together and was quite impressed with them. So that was a training with Fish and Game on how to conduct surveys, household surveys on harvest.

So, yeah, I don't know how that would work with that. I don't think we have any international agreement with muskox but if someone else knows please speak up but I don't think we do with muskox.

MR. KAYOTUK: Thank you, Vince.

CHAIRMAN BROWER: All right, thanks,

Lee.

Rosemary.

MS. AHTUANGARUAK: We brought in discussion from Nuiqsut about the concern that we had seven muskox hit on the Dalton. With that kind of number, we would expect that there may be some recruitment from the population that's along the Dalton that may go into the Kaktovik area. But that kind of a hit to the population numbers would prevent the consideration for harvest because we didn't ever get to the accepted level of population.

But do we have some projection as to, with that kind of a hit, how long, you know, we've already been looking at trying to conserve this population for decades but, yet, this is a major hit in that conservation effort and how much of an impact for longevity on some of these discussions. I think that with that species it is very concerning.

But we also have changes to the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge with efforts to drill and some of the protective mechanisms that we put into that Refuge because of the designation that has now been lifted provides a lot of concern over population managements when -- when we went through in looking at some of the protection mechanisms we had for Nuiqsut with the conservation unit, these are very important protective mechanisms that really look at our planning for the region. And, yet, now, we're -- you know we have two major units that have been changed with protective mechanisms being cancelled, but, yet they

were very contributory towards some of the decisionmaking criteria because you could look at these large swaths of area that had protections and now they're not being protected and it's on both sides. So we're very concerned about what's going to happen.

6 7 8

9

2

3 4

5

And then also with these changes to increase the development process through the Refuge, how is that going to affect the continued research and monitoring because if you're going to change it and allow drilling, you know, some of the mechanisms that gave us the research and monitoring was because it was a Refuge.

13 14 15

11

12

Thank you.

16 17

MR. MATHEWS: Well, there's quite a few questions you have in there.

18 19 20

21 22

23

24 25

26

27

The first one is based on we don't have much data on the muskox for quite a few years that you said -- seven muskox taken out of this population that we don't really have a lot of numbers on, possibly could have an impact, but, again, are they moving around in large areas and that, so I wish I had more information about the population in the Yukon Territory. There may be others on Staff, I'm just not aware of that.

28 29 30

So number 1, my speculation, yes, it would have an impact.

31 32 33

34

35

36

37 38

39

40 41

42

43

44

45

46

47

The second thing on the development and that, yes, that's front and center right now with the Arctic Refuge and that. And I'll just give my own personal opinion on that, there would be a lot more monitoring because of the fact is, I would assume because there's going to have to be all these review processes that have to go through NEPA, all that other stuff so there would be increased monitoring on that level. Say the development goes through, you would know better how much monitoring increase, or decrease, or change or staying the same in other development, you know, resource development areas. But I would project that there will be a lot more focus on it once we get to several steps later. Right now before us is the, you know, what do they call it where they sound waves, I can't think of it right now.

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Seismic.

1 2 3

4

 $$\operatorname{MR}.$$ MATHEWS: Seismic studies is front and center. And then from there would be going into the actual development.

5 6 7

8

9

This is an international and national issue so it is on the radar screen for multiple agencies, in particular, front and center would be Fish and Wildlife Service.

10 11 12

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Just a follow-up on

13 14 15 Rosemary.

What's the seven muskox, what, did somebody kill them or something?

16 17 18

19

20

21 22

23

24 25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33 34

35

MR. MATHEWS: That's new to me and actually when I get back, you know, like I said I'm going to be working up in Cold Foot, so I know some of the people that, you know, do the highway and say what happened here and your request -- I didn't get back to your other request that you brought up earlier and I -someone else can correct me, probably Fish and Game could probably correct me better, you were talking about salvaging -- let's just call it, I can't use a better term, a roadkill, they may know better, but in my area you contact, I believe it's Fish and Game and the Troopers and then you're on a list. This is way out in nowhere kind of compared to Fairbanks and that. So I would guess there's some way of approaching on salvaging that. Now, is it still salvageable, I don't know how long ago, the location, et cetera. So maybe somebody from Fish and Game or others can give a key contact. I don't know if it's DOT -- well, I shouldn't say -- well, DOT.

36 37 38

(Laughter)

39 40

41

MR. MATHEWS: But anyways, I mean it is a major point and I am wondering -- while he's researching, I'm giving him more time.....

42 43 44

(Laughter)

45 46

47

48

MR. MATHEWS: You would be amazed, the visitors, when they come back down and stop in the visitor's center, the first thing is they saw muskox, nothing else really happens. I mean I shouldn't say it

that way but that's the first thing out of their mouth, because we'll say, well, how did it go, ohhh, we saw a herd of muskox, and that was the one.

And then because I have to deal with things like this, I'd ask how many. And hopefully Lee will chime up on this, 15, 13. So anyways it's a major point for people in their once in a lifetime travels.

 And on that there's visitors from -- I haven't finished counting all the countries but it's over 50 countries that voluntarily sign in, they're not -- we don't ask them to do it, Uruguay, China, Taiwan, Japan, Uruguay, all over the place. It's fascinating working and talking to -- New Zealand. Great conversation.

Anyway, did you get enough time.

(Laughter)

MR. KLIMSTRA: Yeah. So I take it the question was about salvaging those seven muskox.

MS. AHTUANGARUAK: Yeah.

 MR. KLIMSTRA: And Fish and Game is aware of those muskoxen, they're kind of, you know, looking into like what happened. To my knowledge, so far, it seems like maybe there was a vehicle collision, which seems to like, jeez, that'd be pretty easy to track down, right, I mean if you're hitting that many muskox and I think four died and there was three others that were injured or something along those lines, it seems like it would do a lot of damage.

But, anyways, the way the State views roadkill is any wildlife killed or injured by a vehicle belongs to the State. If your vehicle hits and injures or kills a big game animal, you must notify the Alaska Wildlife Troopers as soon as possible. In terms of beyond that, I don't know what the Troopers would do in this case because that's such a rare event. But like in, say, the Fairbanks or Anchorage area, there is a list, there's a list they get on. But I think it would just be the discretion of the Troopers at that point, in terms of salvage.

MS. AHTUANGARUAK: Thomas Napageak came

back from driving the Dalton and on his way back he came across the animals that had been killed and so he 2 brought the discussion to Nuigsut right before we came 3 to the meeting and so I brought it into my report that 4 you weren't able to stay for because you had to go to 5 the director's meeting. But one of our hunters 6 7 witnessed the animals that had been killed and then later on we got a report that we could contact Prudhoe 8 Bay to get them. But I wanted to make sure that they 9 10 work with our tribe and try to allow us to harvest some 11 of that resource, but also question about the rest of the -- my ex-husband uses the muskox skin that we got 12 with permit hunts, still to this day, for the (In 13 Inupiaq) like we do our tuttu skins, and those kinds of 14 15 things are very important as well as utilizing the skin for mask making and other factors. So, you know, they 16 only offered us the meat but communicating above that, 17 that we could utilize them in many different ways, our 18 mask makers. I shared this -- the one skin that we 19 didn't cut into, the skin to use, for our 20 (indiscernible) we shared with multiple skin sewers who 21 2.2. make masks and use that hair to make special features that go on to our mask making process. And it is a 23 very special resource that -- it isn't common for us to 24 25 access and be able to utilize but we do have many that use it. 26

27 28

29

30

31

I have request ever since we got that first permit, from hunters and sewers statewide, that, do you have any more, do you have any more, and I know that we could use them in different ways. But if we're not able to get it that's a concern.

32 33 34

35

36

37 38

39

40 41 But making sure we maximize the utilization of that meat, I mean not everyone prefers it but we also recognize there's so many communities that aren't getting enough that we don't want to just let it waste and if we can work with the tribe to improve the distribution, that contact should occur. Recognizing Kaktovik and their efforts and their failures to get any of those permits, you know, another reason to work with the tribe from their community to utilize this.

43 44 45

46

47

48

42

But that's where my thoughts were coming from, is that we want to maximize what we can do with this because they were a loss to the population and we're not able to go out and hunt them and these kinds of things are very important with our traditional

```
and cultural uses.
 2
                     I have others that talk to me about
 3
     collecting the qiviut for the yarn making and that.
 4
     have people asking me all the time did you collect any,
 5
     did you collect any. When we can, we collect it off
 6
     the bushes as we're out doing other huntings because
 7
     the animals move through these various areas. But if
 8
     we were able to access that resource, you know, I know
 9
     we have the one entity that works with the other
10
     communities around their muskox utilization. But, you
11
     know, making sure that we try to take advantage of
12
     what's there. We know we can't get them without the
13
     permits, we have the support of that process for a long
14
15
     time. But this is a unique event where there is a
     resource and there are things that we would do with it
16
     if we're allowed to.
17
18
19
                     MR. KLIMSTRA: Thank you, Rosemary.
20
     Those are excellent points there. I wish more things
     were made out of muskox because I do think they taste
21
2.2.
     very good as well.
23
                     MS. AHTUANGARUAK:
                                        Yeah.
24
25
                     CHAIRMAN BROWER: Uh-oh, Ryan has a
26
     good taste for muskox.
27
28
29
                     (Laughter)
30
                     CHAIRMAN BROWER: He must have got a
31
32
     share.
33
34
                     (Laughter)
35
                     CHAIRMAN BROWER: Yeah, I love it too.
36
     It's pretty good. I've had a taste of it a long time
37
     ago. But, anyway, you should do more to -- where did
38
     you guys bring them over from, from Greenland or
39
     something, back in 1969.
40
41
                     (Laughter)
42
43
44
                     CHAIRMAN BROWER: And then stopped.
45
46
                     (Laughter)
47
48
                     CHAIRMAN BROWER: And so that seems
     like you guys didn't bring enough to make a viable
49
```

population to hunt.

2

4

5

6 7

8

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19 20

21

Just one other thing, if I may, Vince. The North Slope Borough received a lot of complaints in the fall time of commercial recreational activities around Kaktovik. And I had sent a couple of our inspectors to Kaktovik to take a look at what was going on and we ended up giving out several citations and found out some of these operators have decided that they don't need North Slope Borough permits and in some cases, I think they mentioned that they have a Refuge permit. And I would like to find a way that we can coordinate because we're planning in our dialogue with the community Mayor, the city Mayor, wanted a workshop of the Borough's regulatory process. The planning departments to do a workshop with how you can apply for permits, how you could make complaints, how to work with the Department to effect permits and things like that. So we're planning on doing that and we'd like to collaborate with the Refuge folks, maybe do it jointly or something to that effect, from the North Slope Borough Planning Department.

222324

25

26

27

28

29

30

MR. MATHEWS: Yes, that would be excellent. I'm distant to that other than I know that there's a Staff person who's spending a lot of time and I don't know of Lee's background on this. But there's a whole polar bear viewing strategy plan and all that but the issue you brought up is of concern of safety, et cetera, following the agreements on distance and all that.

31 32 33

34

35

36

37 38

39

40 41

42

43

So I will share, via Eva and that, who the person is that could be part of this workshop going forward on it because, yes, is what I hear, she's a good friend of mine, what I hear from her is, yeah, it's complex up there on land ownership, where the Refuge is, where the Native Corporation lands are and on top of that you have a safety issue, we're not going to ignore that, but you have a very high interest from people around the world. I mean they do come through the Coldfoot Visitor Center, they spend the night there, some of them, and then they fly up to Kaktovik to see polar bears. So, yes, it's....

44 45 46

47

48

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Some of the issues that were coming across is not having a valid North Slope Borough permit and when you use your residence as a base of operations, turn your house into an office,

and commercialize your property, there is a neighbor notice procedure that needs to go out through the Borough to make sure the -- you're not impacting your neighbors to agree that they object to the activities and then find ways to mitigate the concerns.

5 6 7

8

9

2

3

4

So those kinds of things that we want to make sure the community is aware of and the best approach instead of just going out there and handing a whole bunch of violation notices. We want to try to work with the community, maybe do a workshop and have that type of approach.

12 13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

11

MR. MATHEWS: I'll get that information to you and, yeah, it's a very complex situation there and I think everyone agrees is safety is number 1, both for the polar bear and for the visitors. It's just working out all these other things and then a common understanding of why there needs to be permits and, et cetera, and we'll see where it ends up. But I will share that through Eva and then you'll have that, and hopefully she will -- it's Jennifer Reed (ph) will get back to you as well as others.

23 24 25

26

27

28

29 30

31

32

33 34

35

36

37 38

39

40

MS. AHTUANGARUAK: We also presented some concerns around the changes of the Dalton Highway and others that are using them to access boats into the North Slope region. We're very concerned because there's a number of them that are using the fan boats and that impact is very concerning, especially around caribou migration. When Archie (Indiscernible) commented at the meeting, it was because he was driving back from medical appointments but he mentioned that he had seen quite a few people going out with different modes of transportation, whether it was off road vehicles, but also with the fan boats. And then we've had other hunters that have also expressed concerns because we do have the ability to go through the Dalton and access areas that we couldn't access as easily by snowmachine and some of those conflicts that are occurring.

41 42 43

44

45

46

47

48

We're very concerned because of the improvements along the Dalton Highway that allowed that scenic byways designation that allows camping with campers that are occurring up there as well as the boat launches. The Borough was really specific in trying to prevent some of that access. But once we had that scenic byways designation it just opened up a whole

round of activity that wasn't normal to the area and is very concerning. We've talked about it, we've shared concerns with Anaktuvuk and we've shared concerns with Kaktovik but this is an opportunity to try to see what we can do to look at what is it doing to that Refuge with these increased activities because there is some deflections that's occurring with those boats and different concentrated efforts of land uses with the group events of floaters that are going through, with the various hunters that are going through. And all of these layers of impacts.

Because it's not just the caribou hunters. It's the moose hunters, it's the wolf hunters, it's the sheep hunters. It's, you know, a whole gamut. And if we limit some of this data collection around one species, we're not addressing the full concern. So doing what we can, this is some key times. We know that there's going to be some other things that are going to happen, but making sure that we take some of those communications.

MR. MATHEWS: The only response I can give to you on that is that, and again you already have a hefty annual report, but it may be something in your annual report, because you're touching upon multiple ways of accessing areas, you're talking about conflicts on different levels, that you would want possibly a comprehensive look at that. I know it's on the radar screens of others. And when it's used -- for the record, fan boats, you're talking about airboats, correct?

MS. AHTUANGARUAK: Yeah. Yeah.

MR. MATHEWS: Right. Yes. different concerns that have been expressed to me personally and I believe the agencies on airboat use in certain areas. So it might be something to consider either in your annual report that there be some looking at this. The Dalton Highway Corridor cuts across north to south, and, yes, it's becoming more popular, because of various reasons. That's the first time I've heard because of the scenic highway. But the point of it is, it is there. And you have resources that you have resources that you depend on that possibly are -- well, their impacted already, but is it going to be greater, lesser, whatever. What is happening to address that possibility. I don't want you to revisit Proposal 57,

but that's kind of the gist of that proposal.

So anyway that's just -- I don't want to add more to your annual report, but I think since it's multi-agencies that are involved with the corridor as well as the Borough as well as others, it might be good to have a consolidation on looking into that. That would include law enforcement.

MS. AHTUANGARUAK: Yeah, definitely. These are all layers of things that are impacting our assessment of the health and wellness of our subsistence activities throughout this region.

Gordon, I do recommend that we look at adding to our annual report, any ways that we can try to get some of this assessment included into what's being reported as we're looking at some of the causation and reaction to some of the concerns we're presenting on various management processes for these species.

But thank you very much. This is very informative. I really appreciate the comments Lee gave in this process and working with Anaktuvuk in this process, because these have been village concerns, but it's not just village concerns, it's regional concerns. And increasing the discussion and acceptance of these.

 We've commented for decades along some of these concerns, but when it was coming from just one village, that was one discussion. But now we've got multiple villages with similar concerns and complexity of the response, and different protections that we tried to put in.

So thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Thank you, Rosemary.

Any additional questions for Vince from

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Is there anything else you'd like to provide there, Vince.

MR. MATHEWS: No, I just appreciate

the Council.

your open discussion on topics. And, Gordon, I appreciate when you summarize, you know, history on some of these proposals, because there is a lot on these, and you guys only meet twice a year. And so I appreciate that. And I know Staff is willing to help with that, but it helps us, too, when you go through those key questions, because sometimes we get on a single track. So I applaud you on doing that.

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Thank you, Vince. And thank you for the report on the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge management stuff.

All right. Next agency report is -- we did ADF&G. We moved that to old business earlier. BLM, and we have Stacey Fritz, right?

MS. FRITZ: And I did provide a report (indiscernible -- away from mic).

REPORTER: On the mic, please.

MS. FRITZ: Yes. Hello. Stacey Fritz, BLM, Arctic District Office out of Fairbanks.

Thank you so much, Council. It's really an honor to be here. Just a big reminder that the Arctic District Office basically manages the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska, NPR-A, since 1976, the Naval Petroleum Reserves Production Act transferred management of the NPR-A from the navy to the Bureau of Land Management.

So I'll just briefly mention what I've provided here is just an update on most of the major permits that our office is evaluating this season. What I normally do at least once a year is provide a spreadsheet, a large spreadsheet with every single permit that we give out in the year with just a who, what, when, where, why, how, fuel, field camps. So that I will be producing -- I usually try to do that in the early summer and get that out. So this is a midwinter report.

So I'll just mention the projects, and then if anybody has any questions about any of them. Some of these I'm sure you know more about than I do.

We have the draft supplemental

environmental impact statement for Greater Moose's Tooth II development project. We expect that draft to be released soon. Don't know exact schedule is available, but it's being renewed.

We at quite high levels are discussing the leasing plan for the coastal plain 10-02 area, the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, because as you probably know, the Tax Act specified that the coastal plain would be managed for oil and gas using NPR-A regulations. So that's why. It's a land managed by the Fish and Wildlife, but BLM is involved because of the NPR-A regulations that are to be used.

CHAIRMAN BROWER: And just a quick question on that there, Stacey.

MS. FRITZ: Uh-huh.

 CHAIRMAN BROWER: Managed through NPR-A regulation, right, and does that mean that BLM will be conducting the lease sales on the behalf of Fish and Wildlife Service or how is that going to work?

MS. FRITZ: I really don't know and I'm not sure if that -- I think that's all being....

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Ironed out.

MS. FRITZ: Ironed out. Uh-huh.

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Very good. It's all so new to us, but we've been -- I mean, I think folks on the North Slope have worked on this matter for 40 years. And we didn't even know what would happen if it got opened. Now it's -- well, anyway, we're waiting I guess to see how that's going to work.

MS. FRITZ: Well, I do believe -- you know, I think this is in here that we're working with Fish and Wildlife, BLM is, to organize two area wide lease sales within 10 years. The first lease sale will be within four years of the date that the Tax Act was enacted, and the second lease sale will be within seven years of that date. And each sale will offer at least 400,000 acres, and will include those areas that have the highest potential for petroleum development. So I think everybody understands that what would happen first is some seismic exploration. So that's kind of

the first thing that the BLM -- our office has a lot of experience with permitting, seismic exploration, is assisting the Fish and Wildlife with understanding how we do that.

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Yeah, Stacey, just -- I don't want to be stuck on this for a long time or anything, but you don't have to have a lease sale to do the seismic; you can get going on that, right?

MS. FRITZ: I believe that's correct, but anything really about that....

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Yeah, just wanted

MS. FRITZ:yeah, above my pay

grade.

to....

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Very good.

MS. FRITZ: The Secretary of the Interior also has indicated that he would like to have a revision of the 2013 NPR-A integrated activity plan. Many of you recall that's the -- and IAP EIS is the management plan for the entire NPR-A that determines which areas will be open for leasing and which areas will be temporarily closed, or special areas, the Teshekpuk Special Area like you were mentioning. So that's in the works.

The Secretary also requested a lease sale of all available tracts, and that was actually held on December 7th, 2017.

MR. SHEARS: Question.

MS. FRITZ: Yeah.

MR. SHEARS: On that one, an alarming little interest in it. Considering, you know, the 2003 notice by USGS that -- can you hear me okay -- the 2003 USGS decision that NPR-A was a gas-prone rich area. And then a lot of seismic activity over the course of the next 10 years that resulted in Conoco making a number of significant discoveries, as well as Kallis. Then that quick lease sale opening the entire area....

MS. FRITZ: Well, not -- yeah, all

available lease tracks.

MR. SHEARS: All available area, showing very little interest. You know, seven bids, 1.6 -- 1-6 million dollars in total sales. What happened? Why was there such little industry interest in that lease?

MS. FRITZ: That is really a question for industry. I can only surmise that some of the tracts that might be value -- have interest are not available for leasing. Too remote.....

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Yeah, Stacey, and maybe to help Bob's train of thought, where the special area corner that's been identified and subsequently expanded a few years ago.....

MS. FRITZ: The Teshekpuk Special.....

CHAIRMAN BROWER:were those part of offerings for lease sale, or are those excluded, because that northeast corner is right in the trail of the Barrow Arch.

MS. FRITZ: Right.

CHAIRMAN BROWER: And where very high probability of hydrocarbon resources are underlaying. And if they were not available because of the special action protective area, that northeast corner. That would only lead me to think that the industry has over the course of time looked through seismic data on the southern portion and has some -- I think the more high probability areas may have been off limits.

MS. FRITZ: And it's really my fault to not have brought the 2013 IAP map so that I could say specifically which areas in the special area are -- some of them are available for leasing, but there's no permanent infrastructure allowed.

 $\label{eq:CHAIRMAN BROWER: Yeah, you can look, but you can't do anything.} \\$

 $\,$ MS. FRITZ: Well, I think -- I guess the assumption is that directional drilling would allow resources to be targeted.

Page 251

MR SHEARS: So I was kind of hoping your answer might lead me to forming a conclusion for my second question to you. Is there consideration within the Administration or BLM as far as investigating the opportunity for making portions of NPR-A into wildlife refuge status, bringing it in -- listing it for wildlife refuge status consideration?

MS. FRITZ: That is certainly a question that's above my pay grade, but I will say that

I have never heard of any such proposal. No, it seems unlikely

12 unlikely.

So moving on, we have the Willow prospect master development plan. BLM intends to initiate a master development plan environmental impact statement that will be similar in scope to the Alpine Satellite development plan from 2004. That will evaluate development of the Willow oil prospect. BLM's in the preliminary stages of coordinating with Conoco Phillips, and is working to identify the list of cooperating agencies. And BLM will reach out to potential cooperating agencies with a formal invitation once a project proposal is submitted from the applicant.

And I do mention here that we have the streamlining NEPA Act. We don't know if that would apply, but if so, that means that the environmental impact statement would be completed within 12 months and the document would be fewer than 300 pages.

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Yeah, that's encouraging. Less than 300 pages.

MS. FRITZ: Apparently it doesn't include appendices though.

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Yeah, you know, when we get an application like that, an often we get a rezone request in excess of 1500 pages, and we automatically stamp it as incomplete. Well, we'll tell you when we finish reading it exhaustively.

MS. FRITZ: Another authorization we've given is for Conoco Phillips to do geotechnical exploration, so basically bore hole drilling at the GMT-2 drill site. That was just a few bore holes. It's not to be confused with the permit. I know North

Slope Borough has given a permit to Conoco for their kind of larger bore hole drilling looking for gravel, which we will also be evaluating. This is a separate permit just for a smaller action at the GMT-2 site.

We have the Conoco Bear 3D seismic survey. There's a map on Page 6 showing the area of that survey. And there's just a sliver of that seismic survey that's actually within the boundary of the National Petroleum Reserve. It's south of Nuigsut.

 Conoco winter exploration in the NPR-A. Conoco's identified six potential locations for its winter exploration program. Three of the proposed drill sites are located in the Greater Moose's Tooth Unit in the NPR-A, and one is within the Bear Tooth Unit. Two are located in non-unit areas. The proposed drilling lies entirely within the NPR-A and within the boundaries of the North Slope Borough. They also may plugged and abandon one or more existing exploration wells.

CHAIRMAN BROWER: I've got a question. You said plug or abandon.....

MS. FRITZ: Plug and abandon.

CHAIRMAN BROWER:existing exploration wells. Is that in NPR-A?

MS. FRITZ: Uh-huh. And that's -- I'm not sure if you're -- it has nothing to do with like the legacy wells clean up project. This is just more recent wells that Conoco has drilled, exploratory wells, and then they determined that they don't want those wells any more. Then they -- if they have time and availability this winter, they will go plug and abandon those wells.

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Yeah. Here's something that you -- you know, BLM and the Borough and probably Conoco Phillips need to think about, and maybe some other operators. Under the Gas Transfer Act of 1984, the ability to -- and I'm not talking about the legacy wells. These are new wells, and that maybe have been deemed undesirable because they're not producing hydrocarbons, but maybe something else they're looking for, or sub-commercial, and that it's not -- the Borough through the act of Congress has given that

2425

26

27

28 29 30

31

32

33 34 35

37

38

39

40 41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49 50 Page 253

ability to the North Slope Borough to work with that operator and BLM, and say, hey, we're going to take 2 that well and evaluate it for use by the community to 3 4 reduce the cost of living by hijacking all of that natural gas. And we need to be doing more one-on-one 5 under those terms with the North Slope Borough to --6 right now, the way that Nuiqsut gets it gas is through 7 the agreement over there at Alpine, which the Borough 8 is spending considerable amount of funds to scrub H2S 9 10 poisonous gas that accumulates with waterflood for 11 enhanced oil recovery. So spend over a million dollars trying to condition that gas so it's usable for the 12 community, and scrub the H2S gas out of it. And if we 13 were independent and had the capability of developing 14 15 the well that somebody else drilled, and handed over the liability to the Borough and then we develop that 16 for the community, it seems to me that would be a 17 better, ideal way of doing that instead of getting it 18 from the oilfield where they use the gas for enhanced 19 oil recovery and maintain pressure plus it also gets 20 contaminated by seawater, enhanced oil recovery methods 21 by where it produces H2S gas, which is undesirable kind 2.2 23 of stuff.

MS. FRITZ: Right.

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Anyway, just thought I'd mention that.

MS. FRITZ: Interesting. That's certainly -- if a petroleum engineer was here, he'd probably weigh in. And I know that there's been some talk of.....

CHAIRMAN BROWER: I know you're the

36 subsist.....

MS. FRITZ:providing natural gas for Kaktovik if development occurs in the 10-02. That's all I know.

Let's see, the next permit I wanted to mention. So Olgoonik Construction Services is doing the remediation of the Wolf Creek legacy wells. It's basically just west of Umiat, so they're building a snow trail down from the 2-P pad. There are four legacy wells down there. Wolf Creek 1, 2, 3, and Tatalik 1 -- oh, sorry, 5, and Square Lake 1. So they went in last summer and cleaned up a bunch of the

surface, and then they're going in this winter to do basically plug and abandonment of those old legacy wells.

3 4 5

> 6 7

2

And here's one that's complicated, and I really don't know that much about, but the UIC gravel mining plan. UIC's proposal to develop a gravel mine just south of Utgiagvik here, south of the airport.

8 9 10

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Is that the map right

here?

11 12 13

14

MS. FRITZ: Yeah, there's a little map there. Uh-huh. Project location there is right smack dab in the middle.

15 16 17

18

19

20

21 22

23

2425

26

27

28

29 30

31

And then we have the North Slope Borough community winter access trails right-of-way. So that will be a five-year right-of-way for the snow trails with the caravans for residential vehicles. And I did just hear that the State of Alaska most likely will not be opening tundra travel in the foothills this year, and so that BLM will not be processing the permit for the AKP route. And I'm really sorry that's the case, because I think AKP would really benefit for that snow road. BLM is still consulting with Anaktuvuk I believe our archaeologist -- so it's both actually the Arctic office and the Central Yukon office, our archaeologist consulted with the tribe yesterday, and now they have plenty of time to work out all the questions, because it probably won't happen until next year.

32 33 34

CHAIRMAN BROWER: So, Stacey, I know I think you're not the right person....

35 36 37

MS. FRITZ: Oh, my gosh,

38 39 40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

CHAIRMAN BROWER:to talk with on that. And we have Staff that are working on this, and, you know, we are bummed that the Foothills -- the weather is not cooperating up in the foothills to warrant a tundra opening. And we are at the Borough reassessing and looking at how we do that in the future. There are other machinery that are all season that are tundra capable that can be used in the summer. If we were to use and contract that have summer-approved vehicles, and we're thinking about that, to overcome the issues about tundra opening. And I think

we're also wanting to work with BLM and DNR and the North Slope Borough I think is -- our direction is to install our own thermasters along those routes....

MS. FRITZ: That would be great actually, yeah.

CHAIRMAN BROWER:so that we can make our own determination and not be just stuck with DNR's determination, because the Borough is well capable of determining tundra conditions, and we've done that in the past. And we've worked with BLM in the best to open NPR-A with our own inspector groups.

MS. FRITZ: Oh, yes. Okay.

CHAIRMAN BROWER: And that was acceptable by BLM. And, in fact, I think it was 1998 or 1999 that we had been requested by a seismic operator, because they had equipment stuck at Anigong (ph), and say, could the Borough make a determination, because BLM wasn't getting people on the ground, so the Borough did provide boots on the ground make a determination, provide an analysis, and justified the means, and then opened tundra channel for those groups. So there's a collaborative need to be doing some of these stuff together.

MS. FRITZ: That seems reasonable. I know that BLM doesn't make the determination on the tundra opening. We just use the State's determination. So do we know that the State has determined they're not opening the foothills, or just don't think it's likely?

CHAIRMAN BROWER: I think it's just not likely, but tundra condition's going to vary based on the temperature and the coverage of the snow. But just be mindful, too, that the Borough can make those determinations as well. The Borough is a home rule Borough, and the charter to effectuate opening and closing of tundra. Just thought I'd dole that out.

MS. FRITZ: Yeah. Well, I'm sure that we'd be willing to work with the Borough. I think it's really a community benefit.

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Yeah. Well, I think that's what we're going to do with the troubles we're having is the Borough has selected lands on the way en

route to Anaktuvuk from the Haul Road, that we might use those selected lands as locations to put thermasters in those.

MS. FRITZ: Well, I'm sure you could put thermasters on the other lands,

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Oh, yeah. Yeah. But, you know, if it were on lands that the Borough had selected -- we don't have them conveyed to the Borough yet, but our interest is that as well, because the route that we've selected to go into AKP would have in its path the selected lands that the Borough would own.....

MS. FRITZ: Right.

21 22

CHAIRMAN BROWER:as a means of protection for the community to put in security shacks or something like that. But it looks like, like you said, the upper foothills, that area, is not going to open or not likely to open for tundra travel based on the temperature. And I stand to be corrected if anybody's on line that wants to correct me.

MS. FRITZ: The other permit we are processing, it's associated with the Aztec fiber optic line between Utqiagvik and Atqasuk. It's a snowmachine survey to plan out the exact route. I think it will have like, what, a mile lag corridor, and they need to figure out what the best route is, specific route is within that corridor.

CHAIRMAN BROWER: And, Stacey, again, you know, we did have some concern at the Borough, because in the comprehensive planning of communities' adopted plans, there are real good indications expressed by the community to connect to other communities with all-season grave roads and get away from dependency on just air service.

MS. FRITZ: Right.

CHAIRMAN BROWER: And one of the concerns that we wold raise is that if we started planning these and have a right-of-way. And I remember as an intern for BLM back in 1997 or somewhere around there, being an intern, one of my jobs was to study an old right-of-way that was submitted by Eban Hopson, and

I think it was 1980s vintage, just before he passed away maybe. I'm not too sure.

MS. FRITZ: Was it a right-of-way for a road or for the electric line?

CHAIRMAN BROWER: It was for -- I believe it was for natural gas, to provide natural gas to Atqasuk and to Wainwright. And it showed a corridor, and we still would be concerned that even utilities, natural gas, roads, be confined to one corridor instead of multiple corridors. And that was kind of what we conveyed to Aztec. Yeah. I think it's Aztec that wants to run the ground fiber to Atqasuk at this point from Barrow.

21 22

 MS. FRITZ: Right. It's a very interesting proposal. I'm personally very curious. I think it's a great idea. They've never done this before, laying the fiber optic cable, just laying it across the ground. There's so many issues of burying it, so many issues with stringing it on poles, so the proposal is to simply lay it across the ground and there would have to be some trenching around rivers to go underneath the rivers. But other than that, it would just get nestled into the tundra.

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Very good. Well, we -- you know, they're going to do that snowmachine trail, too, but we'd be interested to be a participant for the actual review for how BLM's approach is going to be for laying that cable down.

MS. FRITZ: Yeah. We've had one meeting with the Aztec people, talked a lot about how we would make sure that, you know, I guess the issues identified just in the original meeting were, you know, somebody -- it would have to be somehow flagged so that somebody on a snowmachine didn't catch it with one ski or, you know.....

 CHAIRMAN BROWER: Yeah. Those did come up with our dialogue with Aztec, what are you going to do about these folks. They'll go to Wainwright, they'll go to Atqasuk, to Barrow, and they're going to have to snow machine over your fiber cable if you're just going to lay it down. What are you going to do if a ski gets caught in it.

 Page 258

MS. FRITZ: Right. So that's the idea of making sure that all along the route that it's tucked in, like at least covered with snow, and then nestled into the tundra. Not really buried, but....

CHAIRMAN BROWER: All right. Ver good. That's the same concerns we had.

MS. FRITZ: Yeah.

MS. AHTUANGARUAK: Mr. Chair. This is a lot of concern for Nuiqsut. Every one of these projects are risking our subsistence lifestyle. We're completely getting surrounded with these proposals, and these are areas that we were currently hunting in. We didn't get some of the communications on how we could have prevented some of the impacts, especially from the development that went out to Greater Moose Tooth, and the concerns about the migration from that west side towards the village. But, you know, whatever we can do to try to get some of those communications to try to prevent the deflection of the herd, and to try to prevent the impacts to our subsistence harvest are really important.

This turns my stomach. My stomach is just burning worrying about how is Nuiqsut going to subsist, how are we going to be harvesting? We've already had so much conflict of trying to be who and what we are in our lands and waters, and now we're completely surrounded with these projects.

Our village is suffering in so many ways, and we've been engaged to try to prevent this, but yet, you know, we have tons of impacts are going to come from one project, let alone the cumulative affect of just this report, let alone the already approved projects that have been already leased, and are in their current permitting processes that are before us. You know, there's so many things. I can't say we're adequately addressing the concerns to maintain subsistence for Nuiqsut. We're showing that it doesn't matter what we say or do, Nuiqsut just better plan on going to the store and try to harvest from the store and not harvest from the community.

I know our hunters are going to keep trying to harvest. I mean, my son traveled 300 miles. I had two sons travel from Barrow to Nuiqsut in the

last couple years trying to hope that they're going to harvest in the changes that are going on. Part of it was coming to areas that they were used to hunting in, but it was also because of difficulties of harvesting around Barrow and their efforts to share with their extended family members that are here.

6 7 8

9

10 11

12

13

14

2

3 4

5

And these are really complex issues, but I'm just hurting tremendously with this report, knowing that I'm at this table to try to protect Nuiqsut's subsistence, and I don't see how I'm going to be able to do that with you presentation. I really don't know how any of our efforts to communicate at this table is going to give my village the hopes to be able to subsist.

15 16 17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24 25

26

27 28

29 30

31

32 33

34

35

36 37

38

39

These are real serious, and yet you are putting your hat as the North Slope Borough into this discussion. You're not wearing that hat right now. You're the Chairman of this RAC, and yet all of your discussion is coming from your Borough's hat. And yet we have really worked hard to try to prevent this, and yet it's already a given, you know, even these intervillage travels. You already are deciding that they're happening, and yet, you know, some of the protective mechanisms that we put in place to try to hope that we'll have hopes to subsist, how are we going to do this, Gordon? How is Nuigsut going to do this? Should I put my resignation in right now, because I can't protect my village. You know, right now I'm saying this report, okay, give up. What reassurance that my seat here is going to mean anything in the decisions that are coming up, because I'm one person and I'm already against the Chair in this discussion. And you're not providing communications as the Chair. You're the providing the communications as the Borough in this. I have to really push back on you, Gordon. You know, I know you have a hat with the Borough, and it's a very important hat, but you're the Chair of this RAC, and that's really important.

40 41 42

43

44

45

46

47

48

CHAIRMAN BROWER: I think I'm calling a point of order here, and, yeah, I think it is the responsibility of the Chair to provide as much information to these folks, and this also is a report from BLM. The way in which protecting subsistence that these permitters from BLM, for the Borough, is hearing concerns from residents, and providing the meaningful policies to address those concerns. I think this is a

report from them to us of what they are doing, and I don't think it's from here that effectuating permitting process in an agency. They're just reporting to us at this point.

And I do speak from my heart as a subsistence representative here, but I also provide meaningful insight of other responsibilities that these groups should adhere to as well, and not just their own processes, and that's where you hear me chime in as responsible citizen. And I do wear other hats, and I do like to convey to those that need to know that it is not only their processes. There's also home rule Boroughs and tribes and other that are impacted in these processes.

So with that, I'm going ahead and yield

to BLM.

MS. FRITZ: The other permit I think everybody's familiar with, this project, this Iris right-of-way for the earthquake monitoring systems. It's that really interesting project where they have the little basically seismometers that they place around with the solar panels. So this one was just to renew their right-of-way for the one here at Utqiagvik. And we've previously permitted Iris to install seismic stations across the NPR-A. It's happened all across the country.

We provided the right-of-way for fuel transportation between Barrow -- Utqiagvik, excuse me, and Atqasuk. That was also Olgoonik Oilfield Services, secured that right-of-way for tundra travel. And the project is being funded by the North Slope Borough, and Olgoonik has been subcontracted by Eskimos, Inc. to transport fuel between Utqiagvik and Atqasuk.

Other upcoming projects that we have on the horizon, we've not started the permitting, but Elson Lagoon monitoring. That's part of a recently funded National Science Foundation long-term ecological research grant. So we will definitely be working with residents here to talk about that. It doesn't sound like it's going to be really impact, but they would visit sites in the lagoon to sample for water, sediment, and chemistry.

We'll be processing a right-of-way to

haul materials overland between Utqiagvik and Atqasuk for the FAA upgrade of the airstrip and apron.

And then as I mentioned, that larger Conoco Phillips geotechnical exploration to locate new gravel sources in the northeast NPR-A.

MR. SHEARS: A question, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Go ahead, Mr. Shears.

MR. SHEARS: Have you been engaged by the State of Alaska A-Star program on doing desktop or non-field studies relating to route reconnaissance for inter-community transportation routes?

 MS. FRITZ: Not at our level. At least not in our office. I know that actually I think yesterday there was a meeting, a teleconference meeting on the A-Star project. And I think that's the first official communication we've had with the State on the A-Star project.

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Yeah, Bob, Mr. Shears, and to Stacey. That's community access trail?

 $$\operatorname{MS.}$ FRITZ: The winter snow trails, the community -- yeah.

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Those are a proof of concept at the wish of communities to be connected, to see what the economic differences are going to develop as community access trails are open, and see what the commerce changes. And those are -- so if you're dealing -- if BLM is dealing with the community access trails, those are a by-product of A-Star.

MS. FRITZ: Right. That's my understanding. It's like kind of a proof of concept feasibility to see how it works out. So I have collected a bunch of A-Star information to provide to the -- you know, to make sure that everybody who's reviewing the permit, the application, that BLM is aware. And then I wasn't in the office, but they did have a meeting on the A-Star yesterday.

MR. SHEARS: Another question is, how is BLM's report card with our communities in regards to aircraft operations this year?

improvement.

Page 262

```
MS. FRITZ: You mean, how did the communities feel about BLM activities? Well, usually the complaints come through North Slope Borough planning and get conveyed to us. We actually haven't heard that many specific complaints, I think just a general.....
```

6 7 8

2

3 4

5

MR. SHEARS: Good news. That's an

9 10 11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24 25

26

27

28

29 30

31

32

33 34

35

MS. FRITZ: Well, I mean, I think that it's just the kind of baseline. So, you know -- and I get so many questions about it that I just want to point out, I should have provided the link in here that I compiled basically all of our regulations, all the letters, all the activities that we do, all our understanding of the aviation conflict issue, and I have it on the BLM Subsistence Advisory Panel website, So it's kind of like -- in response to that ICAS (ph) resolution, we sort of compiled everything with lessons that we've learned and why it's such a hard issue, why it's really difficult for BLM to fix it. What we can You know, BLM, we have to give permits to people when they fly and land on BLM lands. Any other aircraft activity, we have nothing and no authority -we have no authority over that. And it's really difficult to regulate the airspace. So, you know, in that I provided links to the FAA for people to -- if they wish to do things like that. It's an extremely complex issue as you know. I think there's and NNSSI working group that's getting back in action on it, people looking at use of drones to replace helicopters. A lot of interesting information on why helicopters are so annoying to people everywhere, not just, you know, on the North Slope when they're hunting, but New York City.

36 37 38

39

Yeah, I wouldn't say there have not been any complaints. I don't remember any specific incidents from this past summer.

40 41 42

MR. SHEARS: Not this past summer.

43 44

MS. FRITZ: Right.

45 46

MR. SHEARS: The summer before that.

47 48

REPORTER: Mic, please.

MR. SHEARS: Oh, just thinking, you know, recalling every summer it seemed like there would 2 be a community complaint. Atgasuk, Wainwright. 3 2016. But 2017 sounds like a good year. And perhaps 4 BLM pilots who typically respond that we work for BLM 5 and the Federal government, we don't have to adhere by 6 any flight restrictions except for FAA, and they would 7 fly 300 feet of the deck, had no concept of vertical 8 take off or maintaining a 1500-foot ceiling. Now they 9 10 seem to be getting the message then it sounds like. 11 12 MS. FRITZ: Yeah. Well, we do work pretty hard to consult with communities. We had a 13 project out at Wainwright last summer. We had people 14 on the ground changing the routes daily based on where 15 people were going hunting, had paid liaisons in the 16 community. And, you know, that was to manage one 17 helicopter. 18 19 20 MR. SHEARS: Yeah. Good. 21 2.2 CHAIRMAN BROWER: Yeah. And just for 23 your information, Bob, we do probably collect -- the majority of complaints go to the North Slope Borough. 24 25 26 MS. FRITZ: Yeah. 27 28 CHAIRMAN BROWER: And we do follow up and try to work with BLM on whose aircrafts these are, 29 and provide tail numbers and things like that. About 30 90 percent of them get resolved. 31 32 33 MS. FRITZ: We don't hear about the We just hear about the complaints. 34 resolutions. 35 If there are no other questions. 36 37 (No comments) 38 39 40 CHAIRMAN BROWER: Thank you, Stacey. 41 42 Thank you, I appreciate it. MS. FRITZ: 43 44 CHAIRMAN BROWER: And thank you for

45 46 47

48

49 50 bearing with us,

MS. FRITZ:

My pleasure.

CHAIRMAN BROWER: We have maybe --

refer to Madam Coordinator, the agency reports. Have we gone through the gamut of all the agency reports?

 MS. PATTON: Mr. Chair and Council. Yes. So yesterday we were juggling around a little bit while you and Bob were at the directors meeting. And Marcy Okada did provide an update for Gates of the Arctic National Park and Preserve yesterday.

And again the Arctic Landscape Conservation Cooperative will not be reporting to the Council.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service field office, Ernest Yunak (ph) had an open invitation. They provided a report to the Council at the last meeting. And so they're not here at this meeting today.

report.

And that brings us down to the OSM

And again I do want to note to the Council that we put in a request to the solicitor for the Federal Subsistence Management Program, and he was able to respond by email to the Council's questions and concerns. Robbin has that email on her computer now if the Council wanted to hear that rely at this time.

CHAIRMAN BROWER: All right. Robbin, so you'll be doing the OSM report that includes the dialogue about the charter change.

MS. LAVINE: Correct, Mr. Chair.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BROWER: All right. You have

MS. LAVINE: Good afternoon, Mr. Chair, members of the Council. My name is Robbin LaVine, and I'm an anthropologist with the Office of Subsistence Management. I've been on Staff now for about three and a half years; however, I've been working on subsistence issues in Alaska for the last 16 years or so. I've worked for the Bristol Bay Native Association for a number of years, lived in Dillingham. And I worked for the Division of Subsistence at the Alaska Department of Fish and Game. And now I'm here with OSM. And again

 the floor.

as I said earlier, this is my first time here in Barrow, and I'm so thrilled to be here.

Thank you very much.

So I am here actually in my capacity as an acting Anthropology Division supervisor. And so I'm here as a member of the LT.

So our quick update before we get to the solicitor's email in response to your concerns regarding your charter, is just in regards to hiring. So you may have been aware that there was a hiring freeze, and although the hiring freeze is no longer in effect, any position GS-12 and above requires a waiver and an approval from the directorate. So those positions and requests to fill those positions get sent to D.C. And those positions, GS-11 and below require a waiver and approval from the regional director.

 So we have seven vacancies at our office right now. We are proceeding with waivers for four positions. A staff and supervisor position each for Fisheries Division and for the Anthropology Division.

And I just wanted to let you know that should both those anthropology positions get filled, then we will be fully staffed for the first time in a very long time as far as anthropology is concerned.

And I wanted to thank you, because I know this Council has been a tremendous advocate for the Anthropology Division at OSM. And we haven't forgotten that. Of course, the letter that you wrote to our Region 7 director in 2013, that was written before I came on, but I'm certainly aware of the efforts you made, and I think you so very much.

Beyond that, yesterday we were made aware of some changes to your charter. And while a solicitor was not able to call in, he did invite me to share his email with you on the record. And this is what he says.

Because that language is important with respect to how a few FACA advisory committees conduct business in other parts of the nation, the Secretary's Office decided to insert it into every single FACA

charter across the country regardless of whether it was relevant or not.

Please reassure the Council that Carl and I both reviewed that language last year and both concluded that it is simply not relevant to the Subsistence Regional Advisory Councils missions. It has no impact on how they conduct business and changes nothing. Because it is not relevant, Carl sent a request to the Secretary's Office to have it removed from this program's charters. However, his request was denied.

So the bad news is that we are stuck with that language. We have been told in no uncertain terms that it is not going to be removed or changed.

However, but the good news is that it is meaningless with regard to the Federal Subsistence Program. My suggestion is, he says, not I, that the Council not waste another minute of time worrying about it.

And thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Okay. Any questions about the email from -- who was it from? A solicitor?

MS. LAVINE: Our solicitor, Ken Lord, yes. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

 CHAIRMAN BROWER: Very good. Well, even if there's nothing to do about nothing with that, but the language to me is -- anyway, I'm going to be looking at that language in my own world.

Any other questions for Robbin, right?

MS. LAVINE: Correct.

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Yes, Robbin.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN BROWER: No further questions

(No comments)

 for OSM.

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Thank you for the OSM reports.

All right. If that's the last item on agency reports, and I'm led to believe we can go down to item 13, future meeting dates.

MS. PATTON: Mr. Chair and Council. You'll find the fall 2018 Regional Advisory Council meeting calendar on Page 47. And this is the calendar of all the dates that each Council has selected to meet for the fall of 2018, and also where they would like to meet.

Robbin didn't mention much in the report on the budget updates; however, there is anticipated budget cuts to the program, and currently operating under a travel cap. So unfortunately that puts an imposition on the Council's ability to be able to meet freely in the region. And we've been operating under, you know, fairly stringent budget and have to make very strong advocacy for the Council to be able to meet outside the region and do -- or outside of Barrow rather, and also a cost analysis and justification.

The Council had requested to meet in Point Hope in the interest in connecting with the community in Point Hope, and that community's interest in the Council meeting there. And what I was told by our director is that it's unlikely given the budget cap. So we're relegated to meeting in the regional hubs, which would be Barrow. I will still submit that request for the Council, and that cost analysis. We can see the cost difference. But again most likely the Council would be having to meet in Barrow due to travel costs.

CHAIRMAN BROWER: All right. You have it, Council, that maybe there's some funding issues going on, and that might be cost-prohibitive currently to go for our fall meeting to be in Point Hope. And I do know we've been wanting to get Council membership out of Wainwright for the longest time. If we were to choose a village, I would think Wainwright would be an important target as well. But we had slated August 21, 22. And so what's the wish of the Council. Anyone change that to Barrow because of the constraints the Department is under. So I'll leave it up to the Council to make some recommendations on when and where.

I know we've made it a point to try to meet in villages. I think we've met in Anaktuvuk 2014, and there was another village that we visited. I think it was Nuigsut.

MS. PATTON: Nuigsut, yes.

CHAIRMAN BROWER: We went to Nuigsut.

 MS. PATTON: Yes, it's been of great interest to the Council. Prior to Nuiqsut was in fall of 2013, and that meeting in Anaktuvuk Pass was fall of 2015. And that was at the request of the Council. The concerns that each of those communities was facing and particular subsistence issues that were coming up. We did get approval for those meetings. It's very much the wish of the Council to be able to continue to meet in other villages around the region and serve those communities to make those connections directly in the community, in particular Wainwright since we don't have a representative residing in Wainwright at this time. Point Lay is another community that we're missing a resident of Point Lay.

What I can say is that I will submit the Council's request and the reasoning and the justification and the need in terms of making those connections to maintain that representation across the region, and will do the cost analysis. I just want to let the Council know it's likely that we might have to meet in Barrow still.

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Yeah. And I think it's important, you know, when you do your justification as well that I think when we meet out in the villages and they know that we're talking about their resources that they depend on, I think something happens to the participation level and willingness to engage. Anyway, that's just my -- you know, more comprehension about, you know, where does all these regulations come from and things like that.

With that, what's the wish of the Council. Shall we keep North Slope in Point Hope and let her make that justification, and if they can't do that, the fall-back is Barrow. That was a request that we made in the fall was to take this to Point Hope.

MR. OOMITTUK: So moved.

Page 269 CHAIRMAN BROWER: There's a motion on 2 the floor to time and place for next meeting August 21, 22, to be in Point Hope. 3 4 5 MR. SHEARS: Need a second. Yeah. 6 7 CHAIRMAN BROWER: Been seconded by 8 Anaktuvuk Pass. Any discussion. 9 10 (No comment) 11 12 MR SHEARS: Question. 13 CHAIRMAN BROWER: The question has been 14 15 called for. All those in favor of scheduling our next meeting to be on August 21 and 22 in the village of 16 Point Hope signify by saying aye. 17 18 19 IN UNISON: Aye. 20 (Inaudible -- technical difficulties) 21 2.2 23 MR. KAYOTUK: It's beginning of 2018, you know, things are just getting started and things 24 25 are going to be shifted around quite a bit in the past coming year. I think I see it and I'll be thinking. 26 27 28 CHAIRMAN BROWER: (In Inupiag), Lee. 29 And I extend the closing comments to Rosemary. 30 MS. AHTUANGARUAK: I want to recognize 31 that I've taken a chair in the audience to provide 32 these closing comments. 33 34 35 We were at a point of discussion to a report that was being presented by an agency, and I 36 asked our Chair for help for our village, but your 37 38 response was to call point of order. Robert's Rules around that question whether or not that was an 39 appropriate call, because we were not in a motion 40 41 process. We were open for discussion. But as the Chair I brought out concerns that you were commenting 42 as a land manager and not as the Chair of this meeting. 43 And I have to present that. That is a very concerning 44 process, because you stopped the ability for us to try 45 to come up with solutions with that agency report that 46 47 was open for discussion. 48 When you are doing some of these 49 50

things, I understand it's uncomfortable to be in your role and have multiple hats that we bring to the table for this discussion. But this is a representation process for the Village of Nuiqsut, and you prevented us from discussing possible solutions. It is very concerning on whether or not we're going to be able to have subsistence harvesting with that presentation. And I was trying to ask for help. So I have to bring that back to the discussion, because I couldn't give it at that table, because you chose to call point of order.

11 12 13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

2

3 4

5

6 7

8

9

And I have to question that, because we're trying to find solutions to these changes to give Nuiqsut some hopes of subsistence. This is not an easy process. I'm crying right now, trying to say these words. And we were not given our village an opportunity to talk with this body on possible solutions. We can't turn back the clock. You made that choice and we don't have the opportunity to bring that.

212223

2425

But Nuiqsut is suffering tremendously in our ability to provide for subsistence to our community. And the presentation we just had from BLM only intensifies those concerns.

26 27 28

29

30

31

32

33 34

35

36

37 38

39

40 41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49 50

So I come to the audience table to provide these comments. I'm not trying to belittle the many hats that you're wearing, Gordon. I'm just trying to say that there are questions in the way that this process is going. And we recognize that you have to bring in some of these other discussions, but when you take the premise and prevent us from effectively participating, those are hardships not just for me as an individual on this board, but for my village as a whole. And I heartedly have to caution you in that. Because we had the opportunity to look at some of this presentation and try to come up with some avenues that would give Nuigsut some hopes that we're going to be able to subsist. But instead of recognizing that you have some conflicts when you wear both hats in that chair, you stopped the discussion. I'm sorry, I'm not trying to belittle who and what you are. You've got generations of engagement in this process, Gordon, but these are very important issues. And that's an impact that I can't go back and correct in an effort to request help from the other members in this process, from other participants that here from various

agencies, and putting some discussion over projects that are being proposed by BLM that's going to affect Nuigsut's subsistence.

3 4 5

> 6 7

8

9

2

It hurts tremendously to think about how do I go back to the village in this failure, because we suffered, and we have community members who go to these meetings and they cry about their hardship. I think about Nellie Napagiak Nukapagut (ph) who provided comments about the sick caribou in our previous meeting, and yet you had no hesitation to do what you felt was appropriate, because of some discomfort that was there.

13 14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

2425

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34 35

36

11

12

But I have to question whether or not I can participate, because it is obvious that we're not going to be able to entertain discussions on our village impacts and possible solutions. You proved that today, Gordon. I have to recognize what does that mean for this continued engagement. I have elders that told me I had to get back on this Board, because I did give it up, trying to limit some of the ways that we're engaged. But they told me because this Board deals with our village concerns and our Native allotments that I had to come back here. Unfortunately those elders are no longer here. And I carry that burden on my shoulders when I come to this table. But when you have to open the door in our village and deal with these comments over and over, and this is the subsistence process. Those are real serious concerns, and I don't know how to come up with solutions, because you barred that process. And I'm really sorry that this is an issue for you, but you suffering Nuigsut. Our village membership in this process. It's not just me that you're suffering. I have to try to communicate about this. And yet you barred us from opening discussions on possible solutions.

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

So I don't know how I'm supposed to deal with this, I have to go back and I have to talk with our elders and I have to come up with a way to try to deal with this. It's not something I take lightly. But you caused damage to our concerns and our ability to come up with solutions, Gordon. It hasn't been the first time. But I have to question that, and I have to bring these discussions to all of us, because all of us are facing these concerns in our region. But each one of our villages are at risk for your efforts to protect yourself in that process. It wasn't protecting our

Regional Advisory Council in that process. And I'm sorry, I put it straight out there.

 I respect you tremendously, Gordon. If you haven't been involved in all these years, we wouldn't have some of these protections in place, but we also have our village who is looking at these maps that were included in those reports. And I don't have any boxes near my village that are not leased. There aren't very many boxes that are available for us to continue our subsistence way of life with that report. And I need some help. If I can't get it here with all of us, then you tell me, where can I get the help to give Nuiqsut the hope we're going to subsist and feed our families into the future, because you told me, point of order, we can't discuss it.

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Thank you, Rosemary, for your closing remarks.

 $\,$ And just go down the line this way, and since I'm next to Rosemary.

I'm not going to apologize for a point of order or putting a fellow Councilman down. I think it wasn't a point of order on the subject matter that was on hand. It was a point of order on an individual's participation. That's all it was. So if you took it the other way that I stopped you from communicating with BLM, I did not do that. It was a point of order because it was putting a fellow Council member on the line. And I think that's not something — what our role is to be. We should uphold one another, and I think you're going to have to take it for what it's worth. And I completely accept your explanation, and that's what it is.

As far as the meeting goes, I am still concerned about the way that OSM and others have come before and sometimes do not reflect our view. And I see that periodically, and I think -- and I reflect on those over time. And like I said, I try to express from my heart, because, you know, I'm born up here, I subsist here, and I do my best to represent all the folks that are on the North Slope.

With that, I did enjoy all the dialogue and the reports, and I hope to remain confident in your support as we continue to meet as a Regional Advisory

Council. We've had hardships in the past, and we've suffered quite tremendously with lack of participation. And I've always -- for the last 20 some years have found this to be an important place to make sure our subsistence needs are heard, our communities are heard, and I do that probably with every fiber of my bone. And that's where I close with my own closing remarks.

 $\label{thm:commissioner} \mbox{With that, I'm going to extend the opportunity to Commissioner Shears -- or Councilman Shears.}$

MR. SHEARS: I appreciate, you know, all of you, Rosemary, Mr. Chairman. We bring a wide range of varying skills and professional abilities to the table. And, yeah, sometimes it's hard to distinguish which hat we're wearing when we're up here. But that's the way it should be. That's who we are as individuals. I think everybody here is to represent the over-riding mission, which is to protect subsistence and our lifestyle up here.

Like I said in my introductory comments, I've been severely disengaged from subsistence activities, but I still enjoy the authority of being able to sit here and protect, you know, our right to subsistence, even though I'm not involved.

I really enjoyed sitting here this week with you guys. I look forward to our next meeting in August in Point Hope.

I don't have any further comments, Mr.

Chair.

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Thank you, Mr. Shears. I'm going to move down to Esther from Anaktuvuk.

MS. HUGO: Mr. Chair. At this time I'll pass it to Jerry. I have a lot to say, but we need help. We're hurting. And it's been too long. TAPS been up since early 70s and we're still in the same issue.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Jerry.

MR. SIKVAYUGAK: Thank you. It's my first meeting here with everybody that's on board and I'm glad to be on with you all, and the concerns that's been on the table and that's been, you know -- we need to voice out seriously for our communities here on the Slope.

6 7 8

9 10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22 23

24 25

26

27

28

29 30

31

32

33 34

35

2

3

4

5

And I do have one for the State and Federal, that we do have allotments south of Anaktuvuk Pass, and my aunts and uncles has allotments down there, but they're not allowed to go down there during the winter seasons. And I've attended a lot of round table meetings there in our community to voice out also on their behalf. You know, it's going to follow along with their kids and their grandkids, and Nadrian Alongrun (ph) -- one of them's going to eventually speak up and said, did you guys fight for our rights to go to our cabins? These are our grandfather's, grandmother's allotments there. And it's been on the table a long, long time, and they do have cabins there. And during the summertime, they would want to go down there and, you know, spend the summer down there. And that hasn't happened yet, because we're, you know -they've been fighting State and Federal, and it's -- I want to see some changes here hopefully, and I know it's not going to happen overnight. And it's the voices that the State and Federal has here from our region and our communities, which we will take seriously. And the only time we get to go down there, it's during the winter, springtime. And that's the only time they go check on their cabins there, and they do have cabins there. And their allotment. And as far as building their cabins, that they were told to build their cabins in a diameter, you know, which can be this big or this small. It has to be a certain diameter. And I'm not really found of that.

36 37 38

39

40

So hopefully, you know, we'll have this addressed here, and it's been on the table too long. And I'm proud to be -- you know, hear a lot of concerns also from the outlying villages in our region.

41 42 43

Thank you.

44 45

And I'm looking forward to go Point Hope hopefully. I haven't been there.

46 47 48

Thanks, Steve.

```
Page 275
                     CHAIRMAN BROWER: (In Inupiaq), Jerry.
 2
     With that, Eva, did you want to add something before we
     adjourn.
 3
 4
 5
                                  Mr. Chair and Council.
                     MS. PATTON:
                                                          Ι
     just wanted to touch base. Wanda Kippi is on line.
 6
 7
 8
                     CHAIRMAN BROWER: Wanda, we'll give you
 9
     the opportunity to provide your closing comments.
10
11
                     MS. KIPPI: Thank you. Thank you,
     Chief and our Council members. I just wanted to say I
12
     enjoyed the past few days on line, on the phone, and
13
     listening to all our speakers that we've had through
14
15
     these past few days. And good information, good input.
     And I just wanted to say that we join this group to
16
     represent our communities and for us to be our whole
17
     life to support our communities all together throughout
18
     the North Slope. I just wanted to say that. (In
19
20
     Inupiaq) I'm looking forward to going to Point Hope
     this summer.
21
2.2
23
                     And until next time, until we meet
24
     again.
25
26
                     Quyana.
27
28
                     CHAIRMAN BROWER: (In Inupiag) Very
29
     good. So with that.....
30
                     MR. SHEARS: Motion to adjourn.
31
32
                     MS. PATTON: Mr. Chair and Council.
33
34
     I may, I'd just like to also respond to Rosemary's
35
     concerns and all the concerns raised by the Council.
36
37
                     CHAIRMAN BROWER:
                                       Go ahead, Eva.
38
                     MS. PATTON: That indeed this Council
39
     is here to support the entire region and all the
40
41
     communities in the region. And I want to recognize the
     work and the difficulties of, you know, many difficult
42
     things that come before the Council and the community.
43
     And I just want to make sure that my role as a
44
     coordinator to support each and every one of you as
45
```

46 47

48

49 50 well, and that you have a voice for your community, and

I know it's a tremendous amount of

the ways that can help. We only meet twice a year.

```
2
```

```
Page 276
     information that comes before you and a lot of change
     is happening on the North Slope that are very
 2
     concerning to many of the communities and your
 3
     subsistence way of life. So in any way to keep the
 4
     Council, you know, engaged throughout in between these
 5
     meetings, ways that I can help facilitate as well so
 6
 7
     that each of you feel that you and your communities
     have a voice and ways to engage with the agencies and
 8
     the strength of the Council to make recommendations
 9
10
     that would support each of your communities. So I just
     wanted to add that.
11
12
                     Thank you.
13
14
15
                     CHAIRMAN BROWER: (In Inupiag), Eva.
     So very good words to abide by.
16
17
18
                     With that, I'll entertain a motion to
19
     adjourn.
20
                     MR. SHEARS: So move.
21
2.2
23
                     CHAIRMAN BROWER: There's a motion on
24
     the floor to adjourn.
25
26
                     MR. OOMITTUK:
                                     Second.
27
28
                     MS. PATTON:
                                  Thank you, everyone.
29
30
                     CHAIRMAN BROWER:
                                       Seconded. And all
     those that want to adjourn signify by saying aye.
31
32
33
                     IN UNISON:
                                 Aye.
34
35
                     CHAIRMAN BROWER: We are adjourned.
36
                     (Off record)
37
38
                       (END OF PROCEEDINGS)
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
```

1	CERTIFICATE
2 3	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)
4 5	STATE OF ALASKA)
6 7 8 9	I, Salena A. Hile, Notary Public in and for the state of Alaska and reporter for Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC, do hereby certify:
10 11 12 13 14 15	THAT the foregoing pages numbered through contain a full, true and correct Transcript of the NORTH SLOPE FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING, VOLUME II taken electronically on the 14th day of February in Utqiagvik, Alaska;
17 18 19 20 21	THAT the transcript is a true and correct transcript requested to be transcribed and thereafter transcribed by under my direction and reduced to print to the best of our knowledge and ability;
23 24 25	THAT I am not an employee, attorney, or party interested in any way in this action.
26 27 28 29	DATED at Anchorage, Alaska, this 25th day of February 2018.
30	Salena A. Hile
31 32 33 34 35	Notary Public, State of Alaska My Commission Expires: 09/16/18
36 37	
38 39	
40 41	
42	
43 44	
45 46	
47	
48 49	
50	

2/15/2018